APPENDIX.

OR

THE CRITICKS CRITICISED,

IN DEFENSE OF

THE FOURTH VOLUME OF THE REIGN OF GEORGE THE THIRD.

BY ITS AUTHOR

ROBERT MACFARLAN.

Quid putem? contemptumne me? non video nec in vita nec in gratia nec in rebus geſtis nec in hac mea mediocritate ingenii quid deſpicere poſſint *iſti?* An decertare mecum voluerunt contentione *ſcribendi?* hoc quidem beneficium eſt. Quid enim plenius, quid uberius, quam mihi et pro me et contra iſtos *ſcribere?* Illud profecto eſt; non exiſtimaverunt ſui ſimilibus probari poſſe ſe eſſe hoſtes patriæ, niſi mihi eſſent inimici.—Simul illud, cives, oro, ſi meam cum in omni vita, tum in *ſcribendo* moderationem modeſtiamque cognôſtis, ne me hodie, cum iſtis, ut, provocârunt, reſpondero, oblitum eſſe putetis mei. Non tractabo ut conſules, ne illi quidem me ut conſularem.

CICERO. PHILIPP. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED IN THE YEAR 1797.

434

APPENDIX.

TO THE CRITICKS CRITICISED.

BRITISH MUSEUM

44
9. 39
403.

ADDRESS, &c.

FELLOW-CITIZENS,

THE conteſt, in which you are engaged with numerous and vindictive enemies, is ſo arduous that I think every individual, who conceives his underſtanding to be enlightened with the leaſt particle of knowledge or feels his heart warmed with the ſmalleſt ſpark of patriotiſm, bound by private intereſt as well as by publick duty to come forward at this juncture in ſupport of the national cauſe and to increaſe by his perſon, to aid by his purſe and to ſtimulate by his pen, the general maſs of the people in their exertions. When your fleets and armies diſplay ſuch heroiſm in encountering danger and in vanquiſhing your foes, it ill becomes thoſe, whoſe years diſqualify them for active ſervice in the field, to decline the hazards, to which by an open declaration of their ſentiments they may be expoſed from the tongue of calumny. Being none of thoſe, who upon the arrival of diſpatches announcing the diſaſters of your allies run exultingly with gay and cheerful faces from coffee-houſe to coffee-houſe ſhaking the hands of their acquaintances with joyous congratulations, and who at the firing of the Tower-guns and the il-

lumination of the ſtreets for any brilliant victory obtained by the Britiſh arms on land or at ſea look dejected, forlorn and woe-begone, and with ſuſpicious ſcowl and ſquinting eye ſlink, like unclean beaſts, into holes and corners, as if unable to bear the ſplendour of your triumphs; being none of theſe vile and hateful animals, I come before you bold in the conſciouſneſs of patriotick zeal and independence, and addreſs you upon the preſent poſture and the future proſpect of your affairs.

Though the queſtion concerning the origin of the war is now rather ſtale and out of ſeaſon, there is ſtill ſome conſolation in reflecting that neither you nor your allies were the aggreſſors, and that both acted merely in ſelf-defenſe. By the abolition of feudal tenures in Franche-Compté, Lorrain and Alſace on the 4th of Auguſt 1789 without any antecedent provocation and without any exception in favour of the ſecular and eccleſiaſtical German princes, who had various claims in thoſe countries, the National Aſſembly violated the treaty of Weſtphalia and eight others, to ſeveral of which Britain was a party; and thus by refuſing, after application in an amicable way, to replace every proprietor in his priſtine ſtate, laid a foundation for a juſt war. Not ſatisfied with this audacious encroachment and an obſtinate adherence to flagrant uſurpation the ſame aſſembly, after diſclaiming every idea of conqueſt, ſeized without any ceremony on the 20th of Nov. 1790 the Popiſh Dutchies of Avignon and Venaiſſen, and thus deranged the balance of power in the European republick, ſetting an example of perfidy and rapacity, that muſt, if copied, end in a ſtate of nature, or of a war of all againſt all.

Soon

Soon after this act of treachery and violence the Biſhoprick of Bâle, a ſtate of the empire, was, without provocation and merely for convenience, occupied by a ſwarm of French caterpillars. Theſe outrageous acts of injuſtice naturally alarmed the continental powers, and, after the publication of Leopold's circular letter from Padua, produced a meeting at Pilnitz between him and Frederick William: but, if any treaty was there formed, it was merely eventual and cancelled by Louis's flight to Varennes and the new arrangement that enſued; ſo that it could only be the pretended and not the real cauſe of the rupture between France and Auſtria. Though traitors, rebels and renegadoes from Holland and the Netherlands, were received with open arms and regimented in France, yet Auſtria and Germany were imperiouſly commanded, if they wiſhed for peace with France, to refuſe an aſylum and all the rights of hoſpitality to the French emigrants and other ſupporters of the legal government, which had ſubſiſted for a ſeries of fourteen centuries. In addition to theſe enormities the emperor was threatened with open hoſtilities in a limited time, if he did not reduce or remove his forces in Belgium, while the French armies on his frontiers were formidably augmented.

Having in purſuance of this ſyſtem of atrocious injuſtice and violence overrun the Auſtrian Netherlands theſe domineering upſtarts diſdained from a punctilious regard to treaties to ſtop ſhort at the Dutch frontiers and to reſpect the territories of neutral nations. Pretending that ſolemn treaties are ſuperſeded by natural rights they opened the Scheldt, though ſhut by ten or twelve treaties guaranteed as well by France as by Britain, deſiſted from a deſcent upon Zealand and an in-

vaſion of Holland merely through the terrour of a Britiſh ſquadron; and on the 15th of November and the 19th and 25th of December 1792 paſſed, and acted upon, decrees, which, as they invited all malcontents, of whom there will be many in every ſtate, to rebellion, might be conſidered by all nations as general declarations of war.

It is evident that this iſland as well as the continent was deeply injured by theſe inſidious artifices and inſolent uſurpations, as they materially affected the balance of power, the ſafety of her allies and her own intereſt and honour. To theſe outrages abroad were added injuries at home. The propagators of the new Gallican faith addreſſed from Cherbourg to the levelling ſocieties, who celebrated the anniverſary of the French Revolution as a glorious event, an inflammatory manifeſto, which was circulated with zeal and read with avidity, and produced in return various congratulatory addreſſes to the French legiſlature, who ordered copies of them to be inſtantaneouſly diſtributed among the 83 departments, as irrefragable proofs of the exiſtence of numerous and ſpirited allies. Such was the gratitude of France for the proclamation, which forbad Britiſh ſubjects to interfere directly or indirectly in the war which raged upon the continent! So ſtrict had been the neutrality hitherto obſerved, in ſpite of ſo many provocations, by the Britiſh government that Chauvelin, who remained without credentials at London as a ſpy and an incendiary, could complain of nothing but the word *foreigners* inſerted in a proclamation and applied by him excluſively to his own countrymen, becauſe he was conſcious of guilt and privy to their machinations. Still willing to prevent the calamities of war the king conſented to a nego-

a negotiation propoſed by the Convention on the borders of Holland. What was the reſult? The enemies, who adopted this plan as an engine of treachery, ſeized in the mean time all the Britiſh ſhips in their harbours and declared war, before the plenipotentiaries, Lord Auckland and General Demourier, could reach the place of rendezvous. What plea had they for this precipitate violence? None but a pretended breach, previous to the propoſed negotiation, of the commercial treaty, which, they maintained, you had violated by ſtopping in a moment of threatened ſcarcity at home the exportation of corn and by the enactment of the alien bill for the expulſion of foreign incendiaries, long after they had, beſides various other enormities, ſet many treaties at nought and invaded the rights and territories of your allies.

Since the war then was purely defenſive in its origin, juſtice muſt be entirely on your ſide. But what, you will ſay, do we gain by juſtice, as her ſteps are not attended with ſucceſs? Much in every ſenſe, the approbation of your own hearts and the good opinion of all impartial nations. On the continent, I will own that, through the treachery of allies and not from want of Britiſh vigour, the enemy has prevailed by numbers; for by numbers even vermin may deſtroy giants. At Toulon the puſillanimity or corruption of the Spaniards opened a paſſage to the French into the fortifications; and the ſame puſillanimity prevented the deſtruction of half that navy, of which the other half with the ſtores in the arſenals was either carried off or burnt by the gallantry of your ſailors and ſoldiers. Could this event then be reckoned a defeat? On the contrary it was, notwithſtanding the evacuation of a maritime fortreſs, equivalent to a naval victory of the firſt magnitude; and

and accordingly the enemy has in that quarter made but a ſingle abortive effort with his navy, and that with the loſs of two capital ſhips and of four thouſand ſoldiers and ſeamen.

Nor were the ſucceſſes of the republicans at Toulon leſs diſaſtrous to France than their triumphs in the interiour provinces. If any credit can be given to their own generals, the ſixty battles, the innumerable ſkirmiſhes, and the countleſs maſſacres that diſgraced Britanny, coſt the nation 600 thouſand lives; and the ten other rebellions, that deſolated Nancy, Marſeilles, Toulon, Lyons and other places, muſt have been equally deſtructive. With ſuch loſſes can your enemy be ſaid to have triumphed? Whatever may be thought of the predominant faction, it muſt be acknowledged that the country has been humbled; ſince the reſult has been that by proſcriptions, exiles, guillotines, maſſacres and war at home and abroad, agriculture and almoſt every ſpecies of manual labour can now be performed only by female hands. Had the calamities of war reduced your fields to ſuch a deplorable ſtate, you might have reaſon to complain: but, as the reverſe is the fact, as your national induſtry has according to the king's ſpeech been extended, you have in a comparative view cauſe to rejoice.

But the abettors of oppoſition and the Levelling Societies tell you that your troops have been always vanquiſhed by the French on land, and that reſiſtance is therefore hopeleſs. My anſwer is that your battalions, that have often proved victorious againſt fearful odds, have never been repulſed but by a great ſuperiority of numbers; and that, as the French can avail themſelves of numbers only on the continent, you may laugh to

ſcorn

ſcorn their menaces and bravadoes. At Toulon all the allies, who had fifteen miles in circuit to defend, amounted only to twelve thouſand againſt forty thouſand republicans. After the Spaniſh poſts had been cowardly abandoned, could it be expected that four thouſand Engliſh could recover them, and alſo maintain their own?

The firſt engagement, in which we had a fair trial of French and Britiſh proweſs, happened at Lincelles, " where eleven hundred of the Britiſh guards ruſhing on with impetuoſity, and ſpringing, after one diſcharge of muſketry, into the French redoubts, diſlodged with fixed bayonets 5 thouſand from their batteries and entrenchments, and purſued them with ſlaughter through the village." The next experiment was made at Dunkirk, where, though the Heſſians and Hanoverians were overpowered by numbers, the Britons under the direct command of York continued victorious in every rencounter, and relinquiſhed the ſiege merely from the want of a covering army. In every action during the remainder of that campaign the Britiſh arms were attended with the ſame ſuperiority.

In the next campaign the Britiſh cavalry gained in four different engagements equal honour by repeatedly charging and breaking lines of horſe and foot ſent in vaſtly ſuperiour numbers from Cambray and Liſle to ſurround and capture York and his army. Taught wiſdom by misfortune Pichegru abſtained in future from a conteſt on ground, where cavalry could act: but he found the Britiſh infantry equally firm and invincible, when not deſerted by their allies. At Lannoi, Roubaix and Mouveaux they triumphed over French numbers, and, had they been duely ſupported by the Auſtrians, as was ſtipulated, the con-

concerted plan would have ſucceeded at every point. On their ſide they exceeded their agreement, and when ſurrounded by the enemy, who ought to have been kept in play by the Auſtrians, extricated themſelves with glory, repulſing and piercing the multitudinous hords of the hoſtile republicans, and rejoining after two days fighting the main body of the army with the loſs in killed and wounded and miſſing of only nine hundred men. A little time afterwards at Tournay, where the Auſtrians rather ſtood than fought, they repulſed the French with fixed bayonets and ſecured the victory. When Cobourg refuſed to cooperate with the Duke of York in an attack upon Pichegru for the ſalvation of the Netherlands, the Britiſh, Hanoverian and Heſſian troops to the number of thirty-three thouſand kept at bay eighty thouſand republicans from the beginning of July to the middle of September, and did not croſs the Waal, till the Auſtrian Clairfait left an opening for an attack on their flank and rear. Even when this event took place, and they were left alone, they would have ſaved Holland from the ſcourge of Republicaniſm, had not the ſeverity of ſuch a winter as had been ſeldom experienced, made the rivers plains of ſolid ice, and expoſed their thin battalions to the danger of being ſurrounded by the numbers of the French and circumvented by the treachery of the Dutch. In their retreat, however, the enemy was repulſed in every inſtance.

Such was the ſuperiority of ſkill and courage diſplayed by the Britiſh troops upon the continent. Need I mention their heroiſm in the Weſt-Indies? After ſubduing with infinite hazard Martinique and St. Lucia under Sir Charles Grey, they took Guadaloupe, though defended by more fire-

locks

locks than thoſe carried out by them originally from Portſmouth.

But why, you will aſk, do you detail theſe particulars, which are ſo well known? To remove from your minds the unfavourable impreſſions made by malevolent levellers, and to convince you that the renown of your navy, of which you have no doubt, is equalled by the glory of your army, and that, as the French cannot outnumber you any where but on the continent, you have nothing, and they have every thing, to fear. For how can they reach you without a navy? In balloons? They may attempt it in balloons as well as in flat-bottomed boats; for, though they eſcaped laſt winter with the loſs of four or five thouſand men and many ſhips, the eſcape was miraculous; and now you have tried admirals to conduct your naval operations.

Suppoſe them landed, how few, how unprovided muſt their battalions be! how feeble, how impotent againſt the brawny arms of well-fed Britons! But they will meet with ſupport from the oppoſition, from the Correſponding Societies, from the United Iriſhmen and Fox's cabal at the Shakeſpeare. The conduct of theſe bodies gives but too much the colour of truth to the ſuppoſition. What then? Are not the Directory's ſchemes traverſed by oppoſing ſenators, by affiliated ſocieties and United Royaliſts? Be aſſured that, whatever braggart Frenchmen may pretend, they have no hopes of ſucceſs from an invaſion. The Army of England is but a bugbear and meant ſolely for preſerving internal quiet and for preventing the mutinies, which the impoſſibility of paying to the ſoldiery the promiſed forty millions ſterling might excite. It does not belong to France but to you, who are decidedly maſters

of the ſea, to threaten invaſion and to appoint, as you formerly did, an army for the conqueſt of France. What but this idea made the Directory ſo anxious to purchaſe the Spaniſh navy from the Prince of Peace and from the Spaniſh Meſſalina? What but this project bought the Dutch fleet from the Dutch republicans and expoſed it as a prey to Duncan?

Having humbled theſe three powers in the pride of their ſtrength, in the full bloſſom of their iniquitous conſpiracy, can you dread them now that they are reduced to a ſtate of piracy and to a level with the Corſairs of Barbary? While folly or deſperation urges them to the continuance of hoſtilities, their trade muſt be yours, and you fight them with their own reſources. What but this principle has carried you hitherto triumphantly through the war? Your means to carry it on have uniformly increaſed in proportion to its duration. In vain have your enemies attempted to cut you off from the continent. Your manufactures have found their way to Hamburg alone to a greater amount than they did before the war to all the northern regions. If the French then attempt to exhauſt your patience with expenſe by keeping in readineſs an invading force, they muſt themſelves be expoſed to much greater expenſe, as they muſt for their own ſecurity maintain an enormous army to compenſate the inſignificance of their fleet. Why then ſhould you not prefer an internecine war to the diſgrace of reſtoring a ſingle inch of your conqueſts without a full equivalent? Had old Pitt been alive, would he have liſtened one moment to the monſtrous propoſal of reſtoring the ſhips taken or burnt at Toulon or of relinquiſhing a ſingle title belonging to the Imperial crown of theſe realms? As

formerly

formerly he would have anſwered the French that, if inſtead of having loſt, they had gained, all, it would be time enough for them to propoſe ſuch terms, when they had ſtormed the Tower of London ſword in hand.

And by whom are theſe ſhameful conceſſions demanded? By a nation of hairdreſſers, cooks and taylors, and devourers of meagre ſoup, who, inſtead of baſking, as they expected, in the ſunſhine of liberty, ſmart under the pelting ſtorm of deſpotiſm. That, where they can get nothing better, they can, like the Spaniards, live upon bread and onions and think them food for a gentleman, I grant. But can they pretend to the high blood, to the firm nerves, to the vigour and animation of Britons? No; even in ſpite of French vanity Voltaire allows that his countrymen are inferiour to you in ſtrength, and in conſequence French ſubtlety, as the only ſubſtitute, is proverbial among you. Had he not made this confeſſion, which the force of hiſtorical evidence had extorted, we know that phyſical ſtrength depends upon phyſical principles, on food, on exerciſe and the habits of education, in all which you have long enjoyed an envied ſuperiority.

To a man impreſſed with theſe ideas how ſtrange it is to ſee every mouth in the ſtreets open with this queſtion, "What news? What news!" Can any thing be more new than that a French pettifogger, a French ſerjeant of artillery, or a ſavage Corſican adventurer, ſhould give laws to Britain and ſurround her with the famous circle of Popilius? To an enemy aſſuming ſuch an inſolent attitude ſuavity of manner is out of place. Whatever fortitude in eſſentials your plenipotentiary may have ſhown, the event has proved that

a ſtern and threatening aſpect would have been more effectual.

But I blame not Lord Malmeſbury; for I believe that his conduct was conformable to his inſtructions. Shall I then blame the immediate authors of his inſtructions? Let me be more juſt and not ſkim the ſurface, when I can probe the evil to its bottom. The principal fault is not imputable to the miniſter; its root lies deeper. However unwelcome the truth may be, I cannot help declaring that the national humiliation in ſending ſucceſſively three ſupplicating embaſſies to the continent ariſes from the teaſing importunities of the people, who deluded into falſe hopes of peace by the cupidity of a ſcrambling oppoſition and by the artifice of rapacious levellers goaded on the miniſter to theſe acts of degradation. Though inferiour perhaps to his father in celeſtial fire, and in that deciſive imperious tone that impoſes ſilence on all opponents, he appears from his conduct during the regency-bill and even in the laſt negotiation not to be deficient in firmneſs and ſpirit. Placed between two adverſe parties, the Britiſh and the French, the former cowering, the latter inſulting, he, with the ſteady erect front of conſcious rectitude, reſiſted, as far as prudence would allow, the ſubmiſſive conceſſions of the one and the inſolent demands of the other. If he ſacrificed the Spice Iſlands in the Eaſt, he ſacrificed them to the ſacred calls of humanity, to the diſtreſſes of the unfortunate family of Orange, and to the proſpect of co-operation and future ſervices from Pruſſia. The other ſacrifices propoſed to be made by the uncompenſated ceſſion of Pondicherry and Chandenagore, of Martinique, St. Lucie, Tobago, St. Domingo, St. Pierre

Pierre and Miquelon with a ſhare of the fiſhery on the banks of Newfoundland I hold to be too monſtrous to be defended on any principles, except the proſpect of effecting a diviſion in the Jacobin councils, the certainty of their rejection, and thus without loſs of convincing all Europe of this nation's ſincerity and moderation and all the world of the Directory's unreaſonableneſs and extravagance. Let us then ſuppoſe that, with theſe views and in conformity to your earneſt ſolicitations for peace, he ventured on theſe ſacrifices, as experimental modes of gratifying, reconciling and convincing all parties, are you not bound in honour and intereſt to ſupport him in the retention of the whole, ſince the relinquiſhment of a part will not ſatisfy the preſumption of the enemy? To your importunities he yielded in preference to his own judgment; and now, that the event has juſtified his opinions, you ought in return to bend to his authority, which has the ſanction of experience. How often has he told you that peace with a government that is overturned by the leaſt breath of popular opinion, by the violence of a mob or the caprice of an army, can only be an armed truce, which, from ſuſpenſe, would be more anxious, and from the neceſſity of freſh preparations, more expenſive than an open war?

In mentioning expences I perceive that I have touched a ſtring which ſounds to every ear, jarring and diſcordant, pecuniary emolument being a principle as well underſtood by a mercantile people as by the Pruſſians, Marattas, and Swiſs. Like Mungo, who in the play aſks "what will you give me, Maſſa, if I tell truth," the million aſk "what will you give us, good Mr. Counſellor,

lor, if we continue the war? I will give you honour; and will

> You ſell the mighty ſpace of your large honour
> For ſo much traſh as might be graſped thus!
> I had rather be a dog and bay the moon
> Than ſuch a Briton.

You will not act like the elector of Cricklade, who having received at night from a certain candidate's agent twenty pounds and voted next day for his antagoniſt replied, when charged with miſtaking his man and polling on the wrong ſide, "No, no, I aſſure you; I am not ſuch a fool as not to know that a twenty-pound note is inferiour in value to twenty guineas." Theſe mercenary modes of reckoning are fit only for ſuch a man as the northern potentate, who having accepted 1,200,000l. of your money as a weighty argument for continuing the war, found 1,200,000 Louis from the Convention a ſtill more weighty argument for concluding peace. Theſe pitiful ſtatements of pounds, ſhillings and pence are unworthy of a great nation, who ought not, like an individual, to confine its calculations to ſhort periods, but to extend them to a ſeries of ages, if not to eternity. Otherwiſe it will often find that its conduct has, according to the homely but emphatick proverb, been penny-wiſe but pound-fooliſh.

What but this ſelfiſh attention to the minute and Dutch parcimony of preferring paltry ſavings in hand to ſplendid acquiſitions in proſpect ultimately ruined Carthage? Inſtead of facilitating Hannibal's victorious career in Italy with conſtant ſupplies of men, of money, arms and proviſions, the corrupt and infatuated traders of that commercial ſtate brooding over their accumulated

mulated wealth and hugging its attendant enjoyments murmured at every new tax, obſtructed every freſh levy, and threw ſo many impediments in the way of every ſalutary meaſure that their general was, notwithſtanding repeated victories, obliged through the ordinary accidents of war to remain at laſt either inactive or on the defenſive. The reſources, which his countrymen denied to his importunities, he endeavoured to find in his own inventive mind, and in the conqueſts which he had atchieved in Spain. When this plan alſo failed through the ſurpriſe and total ruin of the Spaniſh army under his brother, Aſdrubal, he haſtened at the command of the Lords of Carthage to the relief of his own country, leaving Italy with tears. But all his heroick efforts proved fruitleſs; becauſe the Carthaginians enervated by luxury could not copy that perſeverance and fortitude, of which the Romans had ſet them an example, when Hannibal encamped in ſight of Rome. It was the invariable maxim of the Romans never to deſpair of the Commonwealth; and accordingly the ground on which Hannibal's tents were pitched, being expoſed to publick ſale, found a purchaſer. Had theſe Phenicians at this criſis when directed by ſo renowned a leader, and before their power was entirely broken, exerted the ſame obſtinate and unyielding temper, which appeared ſo conſpicuous in their laſt ſtruggle, when their matrons threw their gold, ſilver, jewels and precious ornaments into the publick treaſury, and parted with their hair for bow-ſtrings and with their robes for ſails, the empire of commerce might have triumphed over the deſpotiſm of the ſword, and civilization and humanity ſpread over the weſtern parts of the world inſtead of a military tyranny.

But

But are you in the ſituation of the Carthaginians? Have theſe modern Romans and Spartans, as the French vainly ſtyle themſelves, acquired a ſuperiority over you at ſea or on land? I have proved by facts that on either element they are not your equals even with ſuperiour numbers. Why then ſhould not you, not more a commercial than a military nation, aſſume the ſpirit of Romans and Spartans? You have grown old in the poſſeſſion of that liberty, which the Gauls graſping a cloud inſtead of a Juno thought within their embrace, and found upon trial to be a ferocious deſpotiſm, in which ten thouſand lawleſs tyrants occupy the place of one legal, mild and beneficent ſovereign. For their five elective kings, or rather deſpots, in ſpite of parade and enormous unknown expence, live, move and have their being merely in the will of the armies, of the pretorian bands, Spahis and Janiſſaries ſtationed on the frontiers or in the interior. The picture therefore here exhibited preſents to the political eye nothing that is ſtable and permanent. All is a pantomimick ſcene full of mutability and lunatick excentricity.

Will you then whoſe political conſtitution and ſyſtem of government have been conſolidated by time and ſanctioned by experience; you, whoſe mental and bodily frame has been gradually formed by habit to hardihood, independence and high notions, yield in ſelf-denial and manly virtue to a hord of ferocious banditti, who in the delirium of emancipation have relapſed into the moſt debaſing ſlavery? If you ſink into ſuch abject deſpondency, I have miſtaken your character, and can no longer recogniſe that noble and generous nature, which uſed to be incapable of ſubmitting to diſhonour.

But

But let me not be a prophet of ill, when every region of the horizon augurs good. Now that the conteſt is reduced to your own elements, to the ocean, to the Britiſh iſles, and to diſtant coſtly expeditions in the Eaſt and Weſt Indies, I foreſee them, as they proved in former wars, impotent, and you invincible; ſince they will be inferiour in numbers and reſources. In numbers I have already evinced that far from ~~out-numbering~~ you, as upon the continent, and by thoſe means ſupplying their inferiority in ſpirit and proweſs, they will not be able to meet you man to man. Why then ſhould you be alarmed? Becauſe their hoſts at home are multitudinous? Be aſſured that their numbers are magnified and your own diminiſhed beyond all credibility. Dr. Price, whoſe gloomy imagination could be gratified only by ſiniſtrous events and dreary proſpects, proves that the inhabitants of England and Wales amounted at the Revolution to ſix millions and a half. If this ſtatement, which is generally allowed not to be exaggerated, be adopted as a baſis of calculation, theſe ſix millions muſt now be doubled; ſince the conſumption of the metropolis is (*a*) doubled, and the permanent taxes (*b*) on candles and leather have

(*a*) From the firſt Report of the Agricultural Board in the eighth and ninth pages it appears that for a period of 62 years preceding 1794 the conſumption of large cattle in the metropolis, if eſtimated by number and weight, had increaſed above 3-4ths, and of ſmall above 1-half; it is not therefore unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that in the 64 years immediately ſubſequent to the Revolution it ſhould have increaſed the other $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$. Juſtice Colqhoun in his police of the metropolis eſtimates its inhabitants at 1,200,000.

(*b*) In 1711 the duty on candles produced 118,923*l.* and in 1780, 205,776*l.*; and the duty on leather in 1712 yielded 149,967*l.* and in 1780, 229,656*l.*—Theſe are articles not of luxury but of neceſſity, and therefore furniſh an adequate criterion for eſtimating the increaſe of the people.

increaſed nearly in the ſame proportion. From the authentick documents publiſhed by Sir John Sinclair the people of Scotland have increaſed and are increaſing very faſt, and cannot now be leſs than two millions. Add to theſe ſums four millions for Ireland, which is the leaſt quantity ever aſſigned, and two millions for the Britiſh colonies in North America and the Weſt Indies, and you will have an aggregate not greatly inferiour to the preſent population of France. For, after the various ſcourges, which have, like viſitations from heaven for its iniquities, deſolated that country, how much can its inhabitants, and thoſe in a ſuperabundant proportion women and children, exceed twenty millions? The two millions, which once covered the face of the Auſtrian Netherlands, and of Liege, if it ſhould remain an appendage to the republick, will not compenſate half its loſſes. Of the twenty millions of ſubjects and the ten millions of dependents, which you have in the Eaſt Indies, I forbear to ſpeak, becauſe they cannot be brought into action but in the Eaſt and in South America. They are, however, of prodigious weight in the political balance as a ſource of revenue as well as of power; and, if the war ſhould continue for years, may be employed as an engine to emancipate the Spaniſh colonies or the colonies of any nation that may join France and Spain. What floods of wealth would pour into this nation from ſuch a revolution! What ſpring and elaſticity would it give to your manufactures! How it would invigorate your agriculture and accelerate that population that may and muſt be increaſed one third by a law enforcing general incloſure!

But where, you will aſk, are the finances with which all theſe wonders are to be atchieved? Have

Have we not already reached the ultimate limit of taxation and expended our laſt ſhilling? You have, I own, made conſiderable ſacrifices and ſubmitted to many difficulties; but you have not yet offered up your ſilver buckles on the altar of liberty, nor melted your church bells into coin or cannon, nor laid ſacrilegious hands on tithes, nor confiſcated the property of the nobility or of conquered countries, nor ſold and reſold the publick domains. You have not commanded every individual to pour all his yearly income above 200l. into the publick treaſury, and you have not, to enforce the command, appointed twenty thouſand committees at an expence of twenty five millions ſterling a year to traverſe the empire and to violate the ſanctity of private repoſe by domiciliary viſits. You have not diſtributed the people into claſſes and compelled them to pay a forced loan according to an arbitrary valuation. You have not iſſued paper diminiſhing in value, till it ſuſtained a diſcount of 99 per cent. and then broken the plates, as it would not pay for the labour of fabrication. You have not fixed the higheſt price of every ſaleable article, nor obliged all dealers under the penalty of confiſcation to inſcribe on the front of their ſhops and warehouſes the quantity and quality of their goods in every diſtrict, nor compelled farmers to account for the produce and diſpoſal of their harveſt. You have not formed a Committee of proviſions under the immediate direction of a Committee of publick Safety, to which it muſt daily report its proceedings and particularly its right of pre-emption and to foreſtall every where the market and to command articles of the firſt neceſſity. You have not inſtituted a Committee of military Stores inveſted with power to put all horſes, mules and carriages in requiſition, and to declare that in a beſieged town or in

a diſtrict ſurrounded by enemies, articles of the firſt neceſſity ſhould be common. You have not ſtopped the payment of two thirds of the annuities due to the publick creditors, nor induſtriouſly ſearched for the poſſeſſors of enormous fortunes acquired by the crimes of their anceſtors. You have not called upon a rich Engliſh Duke for any extraordinary contribution, becauſe the bulk of his property originated with an anceſtor implicated in a legal murder, nor upon a notorious Scotch Earl, becauſe the only Duke among his progenitors became rich by peculation and perjury. However guilty men may be by abetting the French ſyſtem of rapacity, you abſtain from the violation of property and from the viſitation of the ſins of the father upon the children, and oblige every man in conformity to a more equitable ſyſtem to bear the weight of his own, and only of his own, iniquity.

For what purpoſe, it may be here aſked, have I detailed this ſhocking catalogue of French atrocities? That by compariſon you may ſee the ſuperiority of your own condition, and what a long career you have yet to run, before you arrive at the miſeries of France. For all theſe miſeries and more, I preſume, every man of ſpirit would endure rather than the hug of republican fraternity. Of a republick or commonwealth you had an opportunity of making a complete trial during the convulſions of the laſt century; and you ſoon found from its enormous expenſes, from its auſtere maxims and rigorous inflexibility or rather its ſtern cruelty, that it was not comparable to that genuine, that mild and benign republick, under which you now live, and to the model of which the French, after ſeveral vain attempts at a better, have, like the Americans, approximated,

proximated, and muſt ſtill approximate more, if they wiſh to fix their conſtitution on a proper centre of gravity. Though you have not yet put forth half your ſtrength, you will, by conſulting Sir John Sinclair's tables, find that your permanent taxes, which are every year becoming more and more productive, exceed the French revenues in their moſt flouriſhing ſtate by three millions. When this is the caſe; when your exports and imports, which appear, from Sir Charles Whitworth's ſtatements, to have amounted in William the Third's time hardly to ſeven millions, now ſurpaſs fifty-four millions; when the exports and imports of France are nearly annihilated; when according to Arthur Young's Survey, which is the minuteſt upon record, the yearly agricultural capitals of Britain and Ireland exceed thoſe of France before its devaſtation and its brighteſt periods by 450 millions ſterling; when you have it in your power to derive vaſt aids from the eſtabliſhment of an equal land-tax and almoſt incalculable reſources from aſſeſſments proportioned to the fixed income of individuals, why ſhould you not ſtand erect and look defiance at your enemies? Do not imagine that this ſcheme is impracticable; it was adopted with effect by the Athenians under the auſpices of Demoſthenes, and has been copied ſince by other nations, and particularly by the Dutch in the paſt and in the preſent century.

But Buonaparte threatens; and he can fight above the clouds. Well, let him come; theſe three kingdoms abound with good markſmen, who can ſhoot him flying and ſtop his airy career. What you have to fear is not the want of reſources nor the proweſs of your enemies, but the yellow fever, (I do no mean the yellow fever raging among

among the oppoſition and curable only by circular pieces of a certain colour in the Mint and Bank,) I mean the Weſt-Indian yellow fever, which has proved more deſtructive to your cauſe than all the force and fraud of all your combined foes.

Why then ſhould you not fight ſuch treacherous antagoniſts with their own weapons, and, after reconquering Guadaloupe, introduce the revolutionary ſyſtem into Hiſpaniola by garanteeing to the Spaniards, to Rigaud's party, and to the people of Cape François whatever conſtitution they chooſe, without any other ſtipulation in favour of Britain but a preference, if not a monopoly, in trade? Why ſhould not the ſame plan be extended to Mexico in the North, while your forces from the Eaſt perform a ſimilar ſervice in the South as far as Cape Horn? If the Sepoys, notwithſtanding their religious ſcruples and repugnance to maritime expeditions, can be perſuaded to try their fortune in the Philippine Iſles in ſearch of gold-duſt and precious merchandize, they will ſcarcely heſitate to riſk their lives in collecting ſilver in Paraguay, Turcuman and La Plata, and in opening the road to the mines of Potoſi. Peru and Chili would ſoon fraternize with the other emancipated communities; for, as their frequent rebellions evince, they are all eager to break their fetters and to be as independent as the Thirteen United States.

While you aſtoniſh the Weſtern hemiſphere with theſe tremendous concuſſions, why ſhould not your thunders ſhake the ſhores of the European continent? Why ſhould not an armament of twenty-five thouſand land-forces, with double or treble that number ready on your coaſts to ſecond its operations, alarm the maritime parts of France,

France, and after rekindling the flame of rebellion among the Vendeans, Chouans, Royaliſts and countleſs other malcontents, ſuddenly attack Cadiz and deſtroy it and the Spaniſh navy, or capture Teneriffe with the Galeons and the treaſures of the Weſtern world?

Are you deterred from theſe exertions by your apprehenſions for the balance of power and for the ſafety of your ally? Baniſh ſo groundleſs a fear.

The intereſt of the continental powers will ſecure the integrity of the German empire; and the intereſt of France herſelf will prevent the conqueſt of Portugal, as it muſt become in that caſe an acceſſion to Spain, whoſe impotence and dependence the republicans wiſh to perpetuate. Beſides would Spain without jealouſy and dread behold in her boſom thoſe licentious and diſorganizing legions, that have marked the whole line of their progreſs with anarchy, intermingled with her democratical malcontents? The idea is too abſurd to be entertained for a moment; as the inevitable conſequence would be a Revolution and the downfall of the monarchy.

Were the late Earl of Chatham alive, would not his fiery ſoul be in flames at the very idea of this proſpect? Great as it is, the project would not be too mighty for his capacious mind. This is the counter project which he would oppoſe to the inſolent propoſal of unconditional reſtitutions. Nor would he ſtop here; he would move the Britiſh legiſlature to vote all their conqueſts to be integrant and indiviſible parcels of the Britiſh empire, and procure to the vote the ſanction of every county, every city, every borough, and every corporation in the three realms. Diſdaining parcimony and paltry expedients he would, as formerly, follow

lofty

lofty words with gigantic deeds, ſtun your enemies by the multiplicity, rapidity and weight of his blows, the only effectual means of compelling them on your terms and on their knees to ſue for peace.

THE

CRITICKS CRITICISED.

NAMELESS, but ſapient and profound, Sirs, well might I

Ανδρασι Πυγμαιοισι Φονον και κηρα μενοινῶν

addreſs you in Demoſthenes's words a little varied:

Τί, ὦ ταλαιπωροι, συκοφαντειτε; τί λογῳ πλαττετε; τί ὑμας αυτῳ ου ελλεβοριζετε επι τουτοις; τι ου αισχυνετε περιοχας τας μεν μεταποιουντες, των δε αφαιρουμενες μερη, ἀς ὅλας δικαιον ἠν αναγινωσκεσθαι; τί δοᾶτε ῥητα και ἀῤῥητα ονομαζοντες, ὡσπερ ἐξ αμαξης, ἀ ὑμιν και τῳ ὑμετερῳ γενει προσεστιν, ου εμοί; ει γαρ Αριστοτελης ἠ Αρισταρχος ἠ Λογγινος ἠν ὁ κατηγορῶν αλλα μη σπερμολογοι, περιτριμματα αγορας, ολεθροι γραμματεις, ου αν αὐδον οιμαι τοιαυτ' επεῖν, ωδ' αν ὅτως επαχθεις λογῳ πορισασθαι.

But, convinced as I am that the Engliſh language is not ſo barren as not to furniſh terms ſufficiently expreſſive of any conceptions, I ſhall forbear ſuch pedantry, and not invade a province appertaining by long preſcription to your neareſt and deareſt friends. In return, however, for ſaving you the trouble of conſulting Hederick, you will pardon me, I hope, for obliging you occaſionally to open Ainſworth. Even the French, whom you ſo much admire, have not with their Greek Lexicons as yet entirely proſcribed their Latin Dictionaries.

Though mere phantoms and aeriform adventurers in literature you expect to attract the publick attention in conſequence of that infirmity of human nature, which diſpoſes many perſons to liſten with avidity to the voice of ſpleen and malignity, and of the diſguſt, which generally attends the egotiſm of ſelf-defenſe. Hence ariſes the flippancy of your remarks. Aiming your daggers in the dark you dread no retaliation. Were it not for this reflection, an author urged by the firſt impulſe of reſentment might commence an attack even upon ſuch unſubſtantial beings as *you*.

(*a*) Did not this guide adviſe him not to war
With thin light forms and images of air,
He well might ruſh on your impaſſive train,
And idly ſever empty ſhades in twain.

In the midſt of theſe cogitations a few evenings ago after ſupper I fell aſleep in my eaſy chair, and imagined myſelf ſuddenly tranſported to thoſe regions,

(*b*) ——— in which the monſtrous dog
Huge in his den with three wide barking throats
Makes Tart'rus echo his loud howling notes.

Having neglected or forgotten in my abrupt departure to bring with me the indiſpenſable paſſport and offering,

(*c*) A honey'd ſop impregnated with ſtore
Of the Peruvian and Braſilian ore,

And

(*a*) Ni *vos* docta comes tenues ſine corpore vitas
Admoneat volitare cavæ ſub imagine formæ,
Irruat, et fruſtra ferro diverberet umbras.—Virgil.

(*b*) Cerberus ingens latratu regna trifauci
Perſonat adverſo recubans immanis in antro.—Virgil.

(*c*) Melle ſoporatam et medicatis frugibus offam et
Auricomum ſacro decerptum ex arbore fœtum,
Quod ſibi pulchra ſuum ferri Proſerpina munus
Inſtituit.—Virgil.

And precious gold-leaf'd bough, which once was ſeen
By Troy preſented to grim Pluto's queen,

I was at firſt alarmed and apprehenſive of danger; but recollecting that in the ſame critical ſituation this threatening ſpectre,

(*d*) This triple dog and ſtrange three-bodied ſhade,

had been ſeized by the ſon of Jove and dragged in chains to the light of day, I reſolved to make a virtue of neceſſity and to grapple with the growling monſter. When, after much tugging, I forced the ſavage apparition near to the confines of the ſun, I perceived that his hind parts were not, according to the report of fable, canine, but human and conſtantly varying their aſpect. Of the figures, that compoſed the motley tail-piece, ſome wore ruſty gowns and caſſocks, ſome a barriſter's unpowdered wig and dingy band, and ſome ſhabby black coats and buſhy Dalmahoys, holding urinals and clyſter-pipes in their hands. A few there were with caps of ſophs and beardleſs chins, but more,

(*e*) ——————— on whom appear'd
Rude and uncomb'd a rueful length of beard;
All patch'd and knotted flutter'd their attire,
Their diſmal eyeballs glar'd with ſanguine fire.
——————— Many I eſpied
By the faint glimmering light of make-weight candle,
Whoſe galligaſkins, that had long withſtood
The winter's fury and encroaching froſts,
By time ſubdued, (what will not time ſubdue?)
A horrid chaſm diſclos'd with orifice
Wide diſcontinuous, at which the winds

Eurus

(*d*) Tergeminuſque canis et forma tricorporis umbræ.—Ovid & Virgil.

(*e*) ——————— Queis plurima mento
Canities inculta jacet; ſtant lumina flammea.
Sordidus ex humeris nodo dependet amictus.—Virg.

Eurus and Auſter and the dreadful force
Of Boreas, that congeals the Cronian waves,
Tumultuous enter'd with keen chilling blaſts
Portending ague.

Among this fantaſtick and miſerable groupe fluttered three ſhocking hobgoblins, ſpleen, envy and famine, ſuch as they are deſcribed by Pope, Ovid and Churchill, the firſt deranging their intellects, the ſecond diſtorting and diſcolouring the rays of objects paſſing through their opticks, and the third gnawing their ſtomachs and urging them to deeds of deſperation.

After I had dragged the reluctant captive to the doubtful limits of night and day and viewed theſe fleeting forms with a ſtern eye, they looked aghaſt;

(f) Some turn'd and fled, aſtoniſh'd at the view,
As when of old they to their garrets flew;
Some rais'd a cry; the fluttering accents hung
And died imperfect on their trembling tongue.

The illuſory viſions and unreal mockeries of theſe ſhadowy ſcenes being in ſome meaſure diſpelled by the approaching ſplendour of the ſupernal light, what was my ſurpriſe to find that, inſtead of ſqueezing the triple throat of the infernal monſter, I graſped the three necks of three notorious criticks and bookwrights, and recogniſed the lowering and ſullen viſage of the ſly ſlow doctor *ſine doctrina* yclep'd R. Griffiths,

Who now to ſenſe and now to nonſenſe leaning
Means not, but blunders round about a meaning;

the full-blown, honeſt, unaſſuming countenance of G. Robinſon, of Paternoſter-row, and the thin ſpare

(f) Ingenti trepidare metu, pars vertere terga—pars tollere vocem
Exiguam; inceptus clamor fruſtratur hiantes.—Virg.

ſpare face of my civil and obliging acquaintance, J. Johnſon, of St. Paul's Church-yard. Being queſtioned by me about the interpolations, mutilations and diſtortions practiſed in their Reviews upon the paſſages quoted from the fourth volume of the Reign of George the Third, they diſclaimed all knowledge of the affair, and directed me to wreak my vengeance on its proper objects, the rabble in the rear. At this pitiful ſubterfuge I broke out into high heroicks;

> You ſhall not, wretches, thus eſcape my rage,
> Nor harmleſs libel the hiſtorick page,
> But now I paſs you, as unworthy foes,
> Till of your active imps I wring the noſe.

At theſe words I ceaſed to graſp the compreſſed throats of the three bookſellers, and clenching my two fiſts turned round to attack the mob of authors; when, lo! I found that they had all diſappeared like the baſeleſs fabrick of a viſion and left not a wreck behind, except three grim ugly owl-faced ſpectres of drowſy eyes and ſtupid aſpects that ſkulked behind them, and these after attempting in vain to ſtab me with pikes, threw ſtrait at my face, before they vaniſhed, three pamphlets, which fell ſhort of their aim, and which being picked up proved to be three Reviews. Vexed at the failure of my efforts to puniſh the actual aſſailants I faced about haſtily to regain my hold of the inſtigators; but ſtriking my hand againſt the arm of my chair I awaked and diſcovered that I had miſtaken a dream for a reality. Thinking, however, after ſome reflection that an abridgement of the imaginary adventure would not be an improper introduction to my Criticiſm on the Criticks, I took up my pen and wrote what I have now preſented to the reader.

The

The author of the Monthly Review, who treated Hume's Hiſtory, at its firſt appearance, as he has now treated mine, in order to depreciate the fourth volume allows it only the title of Annals and not of Hiſtory, becauſe the events, which it records, generally ſucceed one another according to the order of time; but his conduct in this reſpect is not more juſtifiable than mine would be, were I to ſtyle him Doctor and No Doctor, becauſe his diploma is Tranſatlantick. He ſeems to think that a mere name will neceſſarily imply an inferiour ſpecies of compoſition; and that in the word, Hiſtory, there is ſome wonderous virtue like that which is always attached to the title, Doctor, and which by ſome magick charm infallibly tranſmits to its poſſeſſor, learning, judgement and taſte. Before he and I part, I hope to convince him, if he conſult the monitor within, that Annals do not oftener contain meagre deſcriptions and dry ſkeletons of hiſtory than the ſkulls of doctors do ignorance and conceit; and that, by his fulſome encomiums on ſome American abortions, he has purchaſed from the College of Connecticut only an empty name and *nihil ſapere*. If the arrangement of hiſtorical events in annual ſucceſſion renders the works of an author Annals, ſome of the beſt Greek and Roman hiſtorians were Annaliſts; ſince by relating tranſactions year after year from the commencement of a war in a ſpecified period of an Olympiad, or by naming conſul after conſul from the foundation of Rome, they adhere ſtrictly to the regular order of chronology, and aſcertain dates with preciſion. In this, if in nothing elſe, the traduced volume reſembles the hiſtories of Thucydides, Dion Caſſius, Salluſt, Livy and Tacitus, whom I here mention not from a vain hope of emulation,

tion, but from a laudable deſire of imitation. In the hands of a good author I have not yet been able to learn in what the difference between Annals and Hiſtory lies, except the name. Counſellor Murphy indeed contends that in his Annals Tacitus is ſparing of words, and prodigal of ſentiment, that the narrative proceeds with rapidity and that every word is a ſentence; but that, in his Hiſtory, he is diſtinguiſhed for ſtatelineſs of periods, pomp of expreſſions and harmony of ſentences. Were this fact, would this counſellor have ſelected from his Annals the pictures of Tiberius in the iſland, Caprea, of the mutiny of the Germanick legions, of the fate of Germanicus, and of the mournful landing of Agrippina at Brunduſium, as the moſt ſtriking ſpecimens of the ſublime and beautiful in Tacitus's gallery of paintings? Would Racine have taken the ſubject and even the materials of his tragedy from the Annals rather than from the Hiſtory? The death of Otho and the capture and pillage of Rome are not more fully nor more pathetically deſcribed than theſe ſcenes. The reſult then is that, if as this critick ſays, "the work has merit as Annals," it muſt have merit as Hiſtory.

The next charge is "that, after a confident boaſt of impartiality and of attachment to no party, I have written in a manner which can give no offenſe to the preſent adminiſtration, and which would probably paſs muſter with any miniſter of any deſpotick power in Europe, &c." To prove the falſity of this *confident* aſſertion I will quote ſome paſſages from the work. "The *miniſter*'s viſage is rather boyiſh and unexpreſſive, and his lank perſon conveys the idea of feebleneſs and languor more than of firmneſs and vigour." (p. 8.) "In perſon Dundas is huge but manly; his

his viſage, though marked with the lines of thinking, is not impoſing; but being a potent drinker he ſoon overpowers this repulſion by his conviviality. His lungs are Stentorian, and conſequently ſtrong, but rough; and, were it any claim to oratory, his elocution exhibits the imperfection of Demoſthenes's. His accent and dialect are tinctured with provinciality, &c." (p. 73 and 74.) "Theſe two peers aided by Lord Mansfield, a man of great legal and diplomatick knowledge, but of tedious and fatiguing eloquence, were the principal ſupporters of the bill in the Upper Houſe; for the Duke of Portland and Earl Spencer, the other two cabinet-counſellors, though great additional weights in the miniſterial ſcale of the political balance, became ſo much leſs from their eloquence and parliamentary abilities than from their blameleſs lives, their ample fortunes and extenſive connections. If the influence of the former has contributed to the tranquillity of Ireland, it is perhaps the only publick merit, which he can plead, being a kind of neutral character liable indeed to no cenſure, but entitled to little praiſe." p. 585 and 586.

After theſe examples of freedoms taken with particular characters here follow inſtances of general cenſure. "The riots, that took place in Edinburgh both before and after this period, in conſequence of the oppoſition made to the propoſed reform by ſome Scotch members, gave a peculiar weight and poignancy to theſe laſt remarks; and the truth of Sheridan's allegations was ſo notorious that, after various ſubterfuges and evaſions, a bill actually admitting them all and providing a remedy for every grievance, except the radical evils of ſelf-election and want of con-

controul, was brought into the Houſe of Commons under the wings of adminiſtration; but, as theſe two fundamental defects made it unpalatable to the petitioners, it was dropped and never reſumed, the miniſters finding it more eaſy to influence the parliamentary elections in the hands of a few needy magiſtrates than in the poſſeſſion of a numerous and wealthy collection of burgeſſes!" (p. 158 and 159.)

The paſſage extracted by this Reviewer proves that I am a friend to a parliamentary reform; and the inconſiſtency, with which he accuſes me, is only in his own brain; for a revolution, or rather a transfer of the property of the wealthy to the poor and profligate, and not a reform, was the object of the acquitted felons. Becauſe I wiſh for a reform, it does not follow that I ſhould, like the Reviewer, patroniſe men who, in my opinion, had reform only in their mouths, while treaſon lurked at their hearts.

"The ſame narrow and timid policy, which fruſtrated Fox's ſtrenuous exertions for the repeal of the teſt and corporation acts, prevented the ſucceſs of an attempt, which he now made to repeal certain penal ſtatutes againſt ſuch religioniſts as acknowledged the unity but denied the trinity of the Godhead." (p. 160.)—Then, after ſtating Fox's arguments, I ſay in p. 165, "Theſe arguments taken in the generality were ſo cogent that it was vain to attempt an anſwer. Burke, who was mortified at the frequent triumphs of Prieſtley's reaſoning, and felt ſore at what he called Paine's flippancy and others termed juſt ſeverity, combated them as applied to the Unitarians with ſucceſs." Thus then it appears that I am a friend to religious as well as to civil liberty, and that

in theſe points I have condemned the conduct of adminiſtration.

P. 628. "The iſſue of *Haſtings*'s trial left upon the character of the miniſters, who moved and carried a vote of thanks to the managers, a ſtain which they cannot eaſily efface, but which they might have eaſily avoided, had they been guided by the ſage advice of that ornament of the Scotch College of Juſtice, Ilay Campbell, now Lord Preſident."

P. 646. "The parliament is blamed for paſſing this vote and for the rejection of the tax propoſed to be levied on collateral ſucceſſion." Were it neceſſary, many more paſſages might be quoted to prove my impartiality and my indiſcriminate application of cenſure, where I thought that cenſure was due. But even-handed juſtice is a crime in the eyes of *a warm republican* critick, or rather of a furious partizan of the Correſponding Society. With a proper reform in the repreſentation of the people I think we ſhall have a more perfect republick than any that now is, or ever was, in exiſtence. How then can I agree with a leveller?

"In my deſcription of the ſeveral ſtages of the French revolution, of French leaders and of French proceedings, all *is ſaid* to be invective without any appearance of diſcrimination or moderation." Let any man begin at p. 175, and read to p. 211, and he will ſee that nothing can be more falſe. Having with a rapid pencil delineated the cauſes of the revolution by tracing them from the numberleſs hardſhips endured by the inferiour claſſes up to their ſources, the original conqueſt and the eſtabliſhment of the feudal ſyſtem, I uſe in p. 208, 209 and 211, theſe

theſe expreſſions: "Foulon being reported by ſome enemy to have ſaid that, were he miniſter, the people ſhould live upon graſs, he was upon the credit of this incredible ſtory dragged from his retreat and hanged upon a lamp-poſt with a ſprig of graſs in his mouth; his bowels were ripped open by a butcher, his heart was plucked out, and the blood being, as we have been told by a ſpectator, wrung out was handed by drops in glaſſes of wine to a ring of inhuman cannibals. This barbarous orgy excited the more ſurpriſe among philoſophical obſervers that the king's viſit ſeemed to have effected a general reconciliation, and to have made the Pariſians quite drunk with joy. Hence thoſe foreigners, who had for want of ſufficient diſcrimination miſtaken the cringing ſervility of the French for genuine politeneſs, which is but another expreſſion for refined civility, endeavoured to account for ſuch enormous exceſſes of cruelty known no where elſe but among the men-eaters of America and New Zealand, by repreſenting them as the exceſſes of the immenſe multitude of adventurers, ſharpers, cut-throats and deſperadoes, which the univerſality of the French language draws to Paris, as the capital ſink of all corruption not only in France, but in all Europe. But, as wolves do not prey upon wolves, nor ſharks upon ſharks, and poverty directs its attacks againſt riches, London a much larger, richer and more populous city, the centre of all commerce and of wealth, and where yet even Mirabeau found a ſharper ſuperiour to himſelf, muſt, according to this mode of reaſoning, be a much fitter theatre for their depredations; and therefore every national convulſion muſt be the occaſion of much greater abominations. Is this a fact juſtified by expe-

rience? The page of hiſtory is an everlaſting proof of the reverſe. The truth therefore is that the French having juſt ſhaken off their fetters, and emerged from the dungeons of ſlavery, acted like ſlaves, who are always cruel. Having ſuffered much indignity and much oppreſſion they ſatiated their revenge like the Caribs of St. Vincent's and the negroes of Hiſpaniola, by tenfold retaliation." "The diſgraceful examples of outrage and cruelty ſet by the populace of the capital were, like other faſhions, faithfully copied in the country and prove to a demonſtration that the preſent ſpirit of inhuman barbarity prevalent in France is not the effect of foreign importation, but the natural growth of the ſoil and the genuine offspring of ſlavery breaking her fetters and acting the counterpart of Tyler's and Cade's tragedies." Is there no proof of diſcrimination here exhibited? The cauſes, the effects and analogies of the revolution are ſet before the reader's eyes in their proper colours.

P. 231. "Influenced by ſimilar motives the Aſſembly repealed the feudal and Gothick law of primogeniture, which ſacrificed the younger and often the beſt to the elder and frequently the worſt male branch of a family, and left the publick to provide for them as for the children of the parochial poor, or rather as for ſturdy beggars, in its fleets and armies and in its civil and eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments. After demoliſhing the three great ariſtocracies, the military, the ſacerdotal and the judicial, which had been the main pillars of the monarchy, and of which they thought that any correction would be only mean repairs on mighty ruins, they reſolved for the increaſe of population to break to pieces thoſe prodigious maſſes of property, which had been

accu-

accumulating for ages, and with the fragments to build their new republican edifice. It is to be hoped that no faſtidious airs of ſuperiority or deſires of retaliating affronts will prevent Britons from following their ſteps in copying this Grecian architecture, which the imitative Romans imported with the Grecian inſtitution of juries into this iſland, and of which ſome veſtiges ſtill remain in Kent." Is this extract too all invective? If it is, I ſuſpect that many will think it an invective againſt that conſtitution which the Reviewer would demoliſh.

P. 219. " This groteſque mixture took the road to Verſailles four hours before Fayette, who was now at the head of the Pariſian national guards, and whom his countrymen at the commencement of the revolution loved to ſtyle a young hero for his ſuppoſed gallantry in humbling Great-Britain by the eſtabliſhment of American independence, could procure an order from the municipality to follow. Fayette was cenſured for not preventing this expedition, which had ſo fatal a termination. But the charge againſt him ſeems groundleſs; for open, brave and generous, and having the beſt object in view, the eſtabliſhment of a limited monarchy on the baſis of liberty, he is painted by his intimates as diſintereſted as ambition will permit, and the very reverſe of Orleans, to whom he was perfectly adverſe and hoſtile." Is this all invective againſt French leaders? Similar examples illuſtrative of this pſeudocritick's miſrepreſentation and diſingenuity are too numerous to be here inſerted: I ſhall however beg leave to produce one other inſtance.

P. 648 and 649. " Yet even France, in the midſt of this deplorable corruption, diſplayed examples

examples of virtue. Many preferred poverty and exile to the forfeiture of their honour. Prieſts could not be ſeduced by wealth to wound their conſcience; and venerable prelates, to preſerve the lives of their clergy, offered to ſacrifice their own. Wives followed their huſbands into dungeons, and mothers their children into foreign lands. Even females in the agonies of torture could not be induced to betray their friends, and men in the laſt extremity exhibited a fortitude not unworthy of Cato."

I am ſaid "to have juſtified the meaſures of the Britiſh miniſtry in commencing, continuing and conducting the war." The commencement of the war I have proved by dates and facts to have originated in French aggreſſion and in obſtinate adherence to that aggreſſion; and its continuance is demonſtrated to have reſulted from the ſame plan in France. That I have not always approved of the mode, in which the war has been conducted, will, without the mention of any other, appear from the following inſtance. (p. 393.) "The great depredations, to which the Britiſh trade was expoſed from the privateers of Dunkirk, were undoubtedly the principal motives that induced the Britiſh miniſter to inſiſt on this expedition. The principle was laudable and the enterpriſe noble; but the means of execution were not adequate to the boldneſs of the deſign. Troops were not in readineſs, as they ought, and as every prudent man expected, to be tranſported as ſuccours to any amount. If the miniſter dreaded the ſpirit of diſaffection excited by the minority among the populace, ſo as to have no confidence in the militia, the attempt ſhould never have been made. After embarking in the enterpriſe, he ſhould have ſelected volunteers out of the

the militia; they would certainly have been forward to ſuccour their countrymen at ſuch a critical moment and in ſo eſſential a ſervice. He might ſafely have truſted to parliament for an indemnity and deſpiſed the clamour of faction." I will not tire the reader with a multitude of quotations; for thoſe already produced are ſufficient to enable him to form a juſt eſtimate of the critick's veracity.

"Inconſiſtency in my account of Edmund Burke is the next accuſation." Let us contraſt the two paſſages and then judge. (p. 241.) "Such was the ſhort-lived conſtitution declared by the penetrating ſagacity of Fox, and by the whole conſtellation of Erſkine's boaſted luminaries, to be the moſt glorious monument of political architecture to be found in the annals of mankind. Have not all theſe brilliant luminaries, who ſmiled at the predictions of Burke, as the ravings of a lunatick, been obliged by the event to confeſs that, though his oracles were delivered in proſe, he was no leſs a prophet than a poet, and that comparatively they are as yet but novices in politicks, and ſtrangers to the vagaries of the human mind? If diſpoſed to forgive an aged veteran retiring from the ſtage this decided ſuperiority of intellect, are they alſo willing to forgive him the poſſeſſion of a penſion? Would they deign to indemnify their patrons by a moiety of monies iſſued in their names from the treaſury? Theſe queſtions might be deemed impertinent, were the nation not become a beaſt of burden and patriotiſm a notorious trade." (p. 630 and 631.) "By literary admirers he is extolled as a poet, and by clerical devotees idoliſed as a prophet, being often filled with the inſpiration of the former, if not ſwelled with the inſanity

of

of the latter." If there is praiſe implied in one of theſe paſſages, it muſt to many perſons appear of a very queſtionable nature; and to a claſſical ſcholar it will be viſible with half an eye that the words "ſwelled with the inſanity of a prophet" in the other refer to Virgil's (*a*) inſane propheteſs, who looked bigger and ſpoke not like a mortal, when inſpired by the emanations from the approaching god." Why ſhould I be ſuppoſed by theſe expreſſions to mean contempt more than Virgil? Why ſhould any devotees be offended at ſeeing Burke's appearance in the act of prophecy compared to that of Virgil's propheteſs? Surely they would not wiſh to have him raiſed to an equality with the Jewiſh prophets. Will the critick's religion allow him to repreſent them as tumid and inſane? Had his mind been capable of elevation, he would have felt that without any miracle the human body as well as ſoul ſwells with great conceptions. So much is this appearance in the order of nature that Dryden's eye and aſpect in compoſing his immortal ode are ſaid to have exhibited ſomething uncommon and divine.

"Even the ſevere ſentiments of the Scotch courts in certain caſes are maintained." I was not, like the Reviewer, ſo impertinent and indeed impudent as to pretend to more knowledge of the Scotch criminal law than the judges of that country.

I am charged with rudeneſs and indecency for deſignating an unnamed Scotch peer by the epithets "*ſlovenly*, *petulant* and *venomous*." Is not a ſtrict adherence to truth the firſt duty of an hiſtorian,

(*a*) Inſana vates—major videri, afflata eſt numine quando
Jam propiore dei.

hiſtorian, and, if theſe adjectives were not juſtly applied, could they have marked the man or given offence? Let the cap be worn by him, whom it fits.

The omiſſion of Mr. and lord, and duke and highneſs before proper names is called *obtruſive* incivility. Of what and upon whom is this incivility *obtruſive?* Has any ſuch incongruity, any ſuch miſapplication of terms, any ſuch inſtance of *ſlovenly inattention* been detected in my *haſty and violent party-publication* of 650 pages? Have I any where uſed, like this cenſor, ſuch a ridiculous expreſſion as *point of punctuation*, or, what is equivalent, *point of pointing?* Can he, who has no ſtyle, comprehend the nature of punctuation, which, for want of ſufficient characters, is, and always will be, in a great meaſure arbitrary and unſettled?

The critick remarks a miſtake in p. 257, where he ſays, "that I have endeavoured *(but not been able to be ſure)* to give his appropriate title to the Right Honourable Amelius Beauclerk, captain of the Dryad frigate. He erroneouſly calls him the Honourable Captain Beauclerk." What a notable diſcovery and how worthy of remark!!! No; egregious trifler, no miſtake is here committed. Captain Beauclerk is here ſtyled *honourable*, becauſe he acted like a man of ſpirit and honour rather than for the nobility of his family. My writings ſhall never be diſgraced by a waſte of unmeaning and fulſome epithets. That practice I leave to you and others, who have been trained in the ſchool of inanity and inſipidity.

His pitiful ſhifts to find matter for cenſure in the careleſſneſs of a yawning printer, or in the treachery of a worthleſs compoſitor, are perfectly contemptible. The letter r is omitted in the laſt

ſyllable of the adjective retrograde. What an unpardonable crime!

In my preface I had ſaid "Some apology perhaps may be neceſſary for totally omitting the epithet *Mr.* before proper names throughout the whole volume. This omiſſion ariſes neither from plebeian inſolence nor from a levelling principle, but from an attachment to claſſical purity and an averſion from feudal barbariſm; *Mr.* Pitt and *Mr.* Fox being as unmuſical in the author's ears as *Mr.* Cicero and *Mr.* Demoſthenes, and likely to reflect more ridicule than dignity on hiſtorical compoſition."—"A ſimilar apology too ſeems due to peers, who are ſeldom deſignated by the circuitous titles of ariſtocratical ceremony, but generally by the plain names, by which their own hands make them known in publick acts. The author hopes that even the nice and diſcriminating ſenſibility of that honour, which enabled them to diſcover a blot in the ſcutcheon of Warren Haſtings, will not be hurt at ſeeing hiſtory adopt, in imitation of Shakeſpeare, their own majeſtic brevity."

Notwithſtanding theſe obſervations, which I thought ſufficient to have laid this queſtion aſleep for ever, this freeborn critick, who characteriſes me as an enemy to liberty and a champion of deſpotiſm, has not courage to look a peer in the face without ſaluting his ear with "my lord, your grace, your highneſs," while I, an humble cowering ſycophant, dare to treat him as a mere man. Were he not a ſorry pretender to patriotiſm, how much better would it have become him to have adopted Buchanan's language to James the Firſt! "I ſee alſo that, by a kind of natural inſtinct, you ſo abhor flattery, the vile nurſe of tyranny and the very peſt of legal ſovereignty, that you hate

hate the ſoleciſms and barbariſms of courtiers no leſs than they are reliſhed and affected by thoſe, who in their own eyes appear connoiſſeurs in every ſpecies of elegance, and, as if they were delicate ſeaſonings to converſation, interlard every ſentence with Majeſties, Lordſhips, Excellencies, and, if it be poſſible, with other expreſſions of a ſtill more offenſive ſavour." (*b*) The Latin original is ſo energetick, that no words in the Engliſh language can ſufficiently convey an idea of the contempt, in which Buchanan held unmeaning titles.

Davila wrote a hiſtory of his own time as well as Clarendon and Sully; yet it will be found by conſulting pages 37, 41, 81, 125 of the firſt in Farnworth's tranſlation, and various pages of the other two that Mr. and other titles are frequently omitted, though, in ſpite of the precedent ſet by Buchanan, a claſſical taſte in this reſpect had not been formed. Hume and all writers of any note uniformly follow this rule. Take this example. "The private deportment of Lauderdale was inſolent and provoking, as his publick adminiſtration was violent and tyrannical.—He had been long a bigoted and furious preſbyterian; and the opinions of that ſect ſtill kept poſſeſſion of his mind, however little they appeared in his conduct. The caſe of Mitchel ſhows that this miniſter was as much devoid of truth and honour

(*b*) "Video etiam te naturæ quodam inſtinctu ab adulatione, quæ eſt et tyrannidis nutricula et legitimi regni graviſſima peſtis, adeo abhorrere, ut ſoloeciſmos et barbariſmos aulicos non minus oderis quam, qui ſibi *omnis elegantiæ cenſores videntur*, eos ament et affectent, et, velut ſermonis condimenta, paſſim *Majeſtates, Dominationes, Illuſtritates* et ſiqua alia ſunt magis putida, aſpergant."

honour as of lenity and juſtice.—This privy counſellor denied upon oath that any promiſe of pardon had been given him. The priſoner then deſired that the books of the Privy Council might be produced, but they were refuſed as containing the king's ſecrets. Lauderdale was probably not aware, when he ſwore, that, the clerk having engroſſed the promiſe of pardon in the narrative of Mitchel's confeſſion, the whole minute had been ſigned by the chancellor, and that the proofs of his perjury were by that means committed to record." Hume paſſim, vol. vii. and viii. particularly pages 53 and 55. When a Duke is thus announced by the ſimple name of Lauderdale, why ſhould his preſent deſcendant, who is only an Earl, be treated with more ceremony?

But by whom am I accuſed in theſe caſes of rudeneſs and *obtruſive indecency?* By R. Griffiths! Quam id (dii boni) te non decebat! What deteſtable hypocriſy is this in the mouth of the man, who picked up a diſhoneſt livelihood by publiſhing and vending The Woman of Pleaſure, that infamous book that was burnt by the hands of the common hangman for debauching the principles and ruining the morals of the youth of both ſexes not only by luſcious and inflammatory deſcriptions, but alſo by lewd and libidinous pictures, that would diſgrace the orgies of Cotytto.

Having ſaid that this writer *blunders round about a meaning*, I think it but juſtice to him and to myſelf to produce a proof of my aſſertion. Page 242. "Practical religion does not ſo much conſiſt in opinion as in principle, in affection as in character." What! Is not a man's religion influenced by his opinion of what is true or falſe, of what is right or wrong? This is a ſtrange and, I believe, a new doctrine. Opinion is certainly

tainly founded on ſome principle true or falſe; and therefore to affirm that practical religion does not conſiſt in opinion, while every opinion muſt hinge on ſome principle, is to contend that in walking the human trunk is not ſupported by the feet, becauſe the thighs and legs intervene. Though he could not develope his idea, he probably meant to ſay that "Religion conſiſts leſs in ſpeculative opinions than in practical principles."

But he proceeds. "When the determined purpoſe and ſettled habit of the mind are on the ſide of moral goodneſs, the ſpeculative opinions, which a man embraces, or the degree *(degrees)* in which his affections and paſſions are agitated in religious contemplations and exerciſes, *are* generally admitted to be points of little importance." By whom is this abſurdity admitted? Not by any man who underſtands human nature. "A determined purpoſe and ſettled habit on the ſide of moral goodneſs" flow directly and immediately from the pure fountains of well regulated appetites and affections and paſſions. Has not the author heard of Young's Centaur not fabulous? Has he never ſeen the beaſt run away with the man, or, what is tantamount, reaſon led captive by paſſion? The characteriſtical diſtinctions between man and man depend entirely on the peculiar management of the paſſions, affections and appetites under ſuch reſtraints as reaſon can impoſe. This critick ſeems to breathe a foggy atmoſphere in which ariſe falſe lights that betray him into inextricable bogs of errour, where groping about him and about him he graſps nothing at laſt but darkneſs viſible. After tediouſly hammering his brain and being long in doleful labour, he does not ſurpriſe us with a Minerva ſtarting from Jove's brain,

brain, but with the lumpiſh and diſguſtful offſpring of Philip's Queen, a mola!

P. 248. In the criticiſm on the Myſterious Mother, a tragedy here celebrated for having the ſtamp of immortality affixed to it, but certainly disfigured by unnatural conceits and full of the palpable obſcure, he ſays "it is currently underſtood" inſtead of "currently reported;" for underſtanding is rather ſtationary than current.

P. 24. "A lady renowned for charity, feeling and intellect." What an anticlimax! Charity, the effect of feeling and the laſt act, is put firſt, &c. &c.

P. 269. "We who can look back nearly through half a century—are perſuaded that *as far as concerns* the correct choice of words, few authors have contributed ſo much as Mr. Melmoth." Where is the nominative to the verb *concerns?* He would have ſaid "As far as the correct choice of words concerns language," or "as far as language is concerned in the correct choice of words." What a pretty critick and cenſor general for half a century! Where is the wonder that the publick taſte has been ſo much improved under his gooſe's quill!

Having ſettled my account with the hoary critick, whoſe mental powers ſeem to decreaſe in proportion to the increaſe of his years, or rather in proportion to the inferiority of his ſecond to his firſt wife in wielding the pen of criticiſm, I ſhall have little occaſion to tire the reader with the eclarciſſement of the diſpute between me and the Critical Reviewer, who has joined in the outcry againſt the omiſſion of Mr. and Right Honourable; but has upon ſecond thoughts retracted, vibrating, like the pendulum of a clock, between two impaſſable lines, or rather, like the ſchool-

ſchoolmen's aſs between two bundles of hay without the power of moving to either ſide. This ingenious and learned cenſor obſerves that in the ancient republicks there were no hereditary titles. But where is the value of this obſervation, ſince the body of the people had no prænomen, which among the Romans anſwered to our Lord, and delicate ears delighted in it as a diſtinguiſhing characteriſtick, as we learn from (*i*) Cicero and Horace. The words "Ego Caius Cæſar tantis rebus geſtis," &c. are equivalent to "I Lord Lauderdale, who have performed ſuch mighty exploits by my perſuaſive and ſucceſsful letters to the Scotch peerage, by my invincible eloquence in the Houſe of Lords, and by my admirable refutation of the financier," &c.

The praiſes beſtowed upon the Third Volume, I have not the leaſt inclination to diſpute. A parent may be allowed to be partial to his own offspring and to find it poſſeſſed of beauties which no other perſon can diſcover. All that I deſire is to be here allowed publickly to declare that, as I am not the author of the Third or of the Second Volume, I have not the leaſt ambition to be thought ſo, or to monopoliſe the praiſe beſtowed upon them by the Reviewers. Nay I now diſclaim even the Firſt Volume, ſince a third edition of it has been in a ſwindling manner printed not only without, but againſt, my conſent, and no attention has been paid to my propoſal of retrenching ſome parts, of enlarging others, and of improving all. I might have ſtopped its ſale by an injunction from the Chancellor; but thinking ſuch

(*i*) Sine prænomine familiariter ad me epiſtolam miſiſti.—Cic. Fam. 7. 32. 1.
—— prænomine gaudent Molles auriculæ.—Hor. Sat. 2. 32.

ſuch a haſty performance, however much praiſed by the reviewers, unworthy of me at my preſent age, I relinquiſh all right to the impreſſion.

That my ſtyle ſhould appear to this critick "rather affected and ſomewhat bordering on the tumid" does not chagrin me; ſince his own diſcovers little elegance and leſs elevation of mind. Who has not heard ſuch writers ſtart the ſame objections to the ſtyle of Tacitus, an author whom they can as little underſtand as reliſh? Merit, which they deſpair of imitating, they enviouſly endeavour to decry. A gooſe thinks a ſwan ſoars too high. This charge therefore I hold in the ſame eſtimation as the next critick's imputation of intemperance and impetuoſity. Tame and ſluggiſh they cannot bear any motion quicker than a Spaniſh carrier's pace, which is that of a heavy animal that holds a middle place between a horſe and an aſs.

The Analytical Review, of which the frame was lately aſthmatick and conſumptive, muſt now be ſo wonderfully invigorated by the healing power of a Specifick, which was in vain adminiſtered as a panacea to an extinct publication of the ſame deſcription, that I muſt not paſs it unnoticed; eſpecially as its known attachment to the Britiſh conſtitution, its open hoſtility to the levelling ſocieties, its uncommon purity of ſtyle uncontaminated by ſoleciſms, barbariſms, foreign idioms and vulgar abuſe, muſt have procured it ſuch an extenſive circulation as to render its cenſure perfectly formidable. I cannot for a moment lend an ear to thoſe who tell me that I am going to enter into a conteſt with a begrimed ruſtick toſſing filth from his cart, or rather to hunt the ſtinkbetſen diſcharging putrid excrements on his purſuer. I know that language, which from another

another would be deemed offenſive, may be reckoned civility from an Analytical Reviewer. Every animal muſt be ſwayed by the inſtincts of nature. A bull aims with his horns and an aſs with his heels. Therefore I do not feel ſore at the imputation of *prejudice and partiality and intemperate expreſſions*, of uſing *ſilly angry epithets*, and of having written *Billingsgate abuſe* and *what is beneath cenſure*. On the contrary I think myſelf bound to thank the critick for his forbearance in not calling me villain, rogue and raſcal, and in not pouring upon me a torrent of other opprobrious epithets familiar to the patrons and well-wiſhers of the parliament of Copenhagen Houſe. I muſt alſo acknowledge my obligations to this diſcerning writer for declaring in his firſt ſentence that "the work is conducted with ability," and for thus kindly ſupplying me, by a general contradiction to every cenſure, with an antidote to all the poiſon that was afterwards to drop inadvertently from his pen. Such a ſagacious and penetrating logician muſt have perceived that a "literary work conducted with ability" could never be juſtly chargeable with *prejudice, partiality, intemperance of language, Billingsgate abuſe*, and *ſilly angry epithets beneath cenſure*; and therefore I ſhall conſider him as a friend accumulating an incoherent maſs of diſcordant elements which he wiſhes to ſee expoſed. Upon theſe principles I need not be ceremonious. I ſhall only have to guard my own perſon from contracting any offenſive odour from my mode of repelling his fetid eructations, and to retoſs the dung aimed in vain by this nightman at my head without ſoiling my own fingers.

Mr. M. ſays the critick, "announces his intention to perſevere in his hiſtory till the concluſion

ſion of *peace*, we ſuppoſe he means till the concluſion of the *war*." By no means. Mr. M. announces his intention of perſevering in the *continuation* of his hiſtory till the concluſion or final arrangement of peace; for peace is ſubſequent to war and has in its arrangement a beginning, a middle and an end or concluſion or cloſe, as well as war. Hence Shakeſpeare ſays——

> They humbly ſue unto your excellence
> To have a goodly peace concluded of
> Between the realms of England and of France,

or in other words they humbly ſue for the concluſion of a goodly peace, &c. Mr. Fox publickly acknowledged in the Houſe of Commons that Mr. Pitt is the greateſt maſter of language in the kingdom: yet this ſame Pitt uſes in the laſt king's ſpeech the phraſe "concluſion of peace" twice; and, if it had not been Engliſh, the croud of Engliſh members at the cockpit would probably have diſcovered the ſoleciſm.

"If it were neceſſary to offer any additional *inſtance* of prejudice and partiality to *thoſe* already adduced, it ſhould be the indignation," &c. In this ſentence there is no ſubſtantive but *inſtance* to which *thoſe* can be referred. The author forbore, doubtleſsly on purpoſe, to diſentangle his confuſed ideas; and to leave a field for criticiſm choſe not to expreſs them grammatically thus. If, in addition to ſo many an inſtance of prejudice and partiality already adduced, it were neceſſary to produce any other, it ſhould be, &c.

With the ſame benevolent intention he has in the following ſentence put *or* for *nor* and in the ſucceeding *other* for *others*, and after the word nobility a colon for a period. "After theſe obſervations on particular defects in the volume before us it is unneceſſary to add any general remarks,

marks, *or* ſhall we condeſcend to cenſure—what are infinitely below cenſure---the ſilly angry epithets, annexed to the name of that "*ſavage Corſican* adventurer" Buonaparte." How a particular remark on words applied to an individual can be general, Ariſtotle, were he to riſe from the dead, could not explain. "The expedition to Quiberon is *only* regretted becauſe its iſſue was unfortunate; and England is honourably acquitted of the guilt of any attempt to excite inſurrections in France, although the Count of Artois, by her aſſiſtance, diſplayed the white flag on the coaſt of Britanny, and a body of ten thouſand emigrants was paid by her, and regimented under Puiſaye, Sombreuil and *other* of the french nobility: as to the deteſtable and unprecedented meanneſs of forging aſſignats, our author has very *impartially* omitted the account of it entirely; ſcarcely any thing but the teſtimony of a court of juſtice would be ſufficient to eſtabliſh this fact, ſo nefarious in itſelf, and ſo diſgraceful to the nation." What a jumble of commas, colons, ſemicolons and unconnected ideas is here! The forgery of aſſignats, a new ſubject expreſſed in a new form of words which required not only a preceding period but alſo a new paragraph, ſucceeds a colon; and then after a ſemicolon comes *the teſtimony of a court of juſtice* inſtead of *teſtimonies exhibited in a court of juſtice*. I forbear to inveigh againſt the Gallic barbariſm of confounding the eye by writing french, &c. for French. The author is accuſed of partiality in omitting what till now he never heard. What an enormity! Where is the wonder that he ſhould not have ſeen what, he believes, hardly any literary man has ſeen or can bear to read, the dry notes of an obſcure reporter; and that he ſhould not have reprobated, like the Reviewer, what has been ſolemnly approved by

the ſages of Engliſh law! What is this but to charge me with a deficiency in republican arrogance, preſumption and impudence! But what elſe could be expected from a deſperado who had the folly and audacity to aſſume a ſuperiority of knowledge in the Scotch laws over the Scotch judges?

That I have been too diffuſe in my relation of the French revolution is an accuſation of a ſimilar nature. The turpitude of French conduct has been ſuch that Levellers wiſh all eyes to be averted from its contemplation. I, on the contrary, have attempted, by placing the ſeveral events in a luminous point of view, to fix Britiſh attention on a varied ſcene, in which ſome particulars deſerve imitation, but moſt reprobation, being infamous in their origin and diſgraceful in their concluſion. In a conteſt between two powers a comparative ſtatement of their reſources, their counſels and exertions is neceſſary to the formation of a juſt eſtimate; and this compariſon unavoidably requires a minute detail. What renders the ſtruggles of the Carthaginians and Numidians againſt the Romans in the ſecond Punick and in the Jugurthin war ſo intereſting? The contraſt between the abilities, the characters, the ſpeeches and the preparations of the different leaders of the two nations. I have followed, as far as I was able, the ſame plan in this part of my hiſtory, but without indulging myſelf with a ſingle digreſſive epiſode reſembling the extraneous ſtory of the Phileni. The *unprecedented* meanneſs of forging aſſignats! How could that be *unprecedented*, for which the critick's French connections had furniſhed a thouſand precedents? But theſe ravings were intentional, and deſerve my thanks.

Theſe, however, are not the only advantages with

with which his beneficence has favoured me in this chaotick medley, this rickety and disjointed ſentence of ſentences. "I ought to have condemned the expedition to Quiberon and the forgery of aſſignats," or in other words I ought to have reprobated all retaliation, all annoyance of an open enemy at war, and to have recommended the purchaſe of aſſignats from the Convention for the payment of the emigrants; ſince no other money was then current in France! Though no conſummation is more devoutly to be wiſhed than the puniſhment of a perfidious foe by his own arts, I ought to have anathematiſed the deciſion of our courts of juſtice founded on this principle, and to have admitted the excluſive right of the French to poiſoned arms on land and to red hot balls at ſea. I wonder that, among his other conceſſions to the French, he has not included the privilege of invading Britain and Ireland without moleſtation, and declared it to be a cruel caſe that they were not allowed to deſolate Wales by plunder, murder and rape, and to put arms into the hands of thoſe humane and merciful ſocieties called United Iriſhmen, that their banditti might copy the example of the Gallick republicans and cut the throats of the thirty thouſand patrician and plebeian ſenators and gentlemen that were regiſtered in their firſt liſt of proſcription.

But this is not all. Becauſe I reprobated "the treacherous arts of the French republick to excite commotions in Britain and to detach the people from the king and his government" *in a time of profound peace, and before France perfidiouſly and precipitately declared war*, I ought to have chaſtiſed our miniſtry ſeverely for granting any ſupport to the emigrants in their invaſion of Britanny for the purpoſe of renewing a general inſurrection *in a period of long declared war, of open hoſtilities*, and

and after no quarter was to be given by the French troops to Britons. Is not this the doctrine of a French emiſſary and a furious partizan of democracy? The cloven foot is evident; but it is the cloven foot of a friend that meant by ſuch extravagance to aid my cauſe.

The *ſilly angry epithets ſavage Corſican adventurer are beneath cenſure.* The following words applied by Livy to the mighty Hannibal muſt be ſtill more beneath cenſure. "(*k*) He was inhumanly cruel, and perfidious beyond the Punick ſtandard; he paid no regard to truth or honour, none to the gods, none to oaths, none to religion." Buonaparte is certainly a Corſican; and I am not the firſt that called him *ſavage*. Read page 382 of this Corſican's campaigns, and you will find theſe words, "little corrections given by his equals had no effect on the haughty and *ſavage* diſpoſition of this young man." Read an account of the maſſacres committed under his direction in Vendee, at Toulon, and at Paris, when he acted as ſecond to Barras in quelling the inſurgent ſections; read the detail of the numbers of Italian peaſants ſhot by his orders in cold blood at Arquata, Lugo, Lodi and other places for riſing in ams againſt plunder and tyranny; and then tell me whether the epithet ſavage is miſapplied, and whether a ſecond lieutenant of artillery ſuddenly raiſed to the rank of generaliſſimo upon condition of marrying a guillotined nobleman's widow may not juſtly be termed *an adventurer*. If all this damning evidence will not ſatisfy you, conſult the ſpeech of Landſdown, one of your own oracles, in 1795; for he tells you from Necker

(*k*) — inhumana crudelitas, perfidia plus quam Punica; nihil veri, nihil ſancti, nullus deûm metus, nullum jusjurandum, nulla religio. Lib. 21. cap. 4.

Necker and Volney that "Corſica is a rock perfectly *ſavage* and uncultivated, with a fickle, reſtleſs and faithleſs race of men going to the plough armed, coming to the elections with ſwords, piſtols and ſtilettos, and ſelling their votes at a ſtated price, like merchandize; governed by ten ariſtocratical chiefs, who quarrel and agree alternately by reciprocal grants of places and penſions, and derange to-day the arrangement of yeſterday for the expreſs purpoſe of extorting freſh conceſſions." Among this reſpectable band Buonaparte acted a conſpicuous part in the diſturbances which agitated that iſland in 1789; and, as the ſpecifick and ſtill more the individual muſt be included in the generick term, he cannot eſcape the imputation of ſavageneſs, a vice found in Marius, Sylla and other able and fortunate generals.

Now let us examine the inſtances of vulgarity and Billingſgate, with which the volume teems. "Chauvelin who unacknowledged and without credentials remained in London to ſerve as a focus to collect the ſcattered rays of ſedition and to furniſh incendiaries with fuel." A rare example of *Billingsgate abuſe!* Of what a peculiar conſtruction, of what a diſtempered and vitiated frame, muſt that Britiſh mind (if mind it can be called) be, that does not feel the objects here grouped to be beauties and not deformities! But I miſtake the caſe. We have not here the mind of a Briton but of a Jacobin ſickening at a picturesque exhibition of truth, pining at the loſs of Chauvelin's circulated aſſignats and weeping at the extinction of ſedition's fire for want of that fuel in its focus.

"Barrere is called the mouth-piece to the Committee of Publick Safety and Liar-general to the Convention." *Mouth-piece*, a word applied to Burke in G. Grenville's State of the Nation, is more

more harmonious than *mouth-friend* uſed by Shakeſpeare, and liar-general is as claſſical as attorney-general. As to the eſſential point, the veracity of Barrere, my ſtatement of it is ſufficiently juſtified by his repreſentation of the engagement on the memorable 1ſt of June; for upon learning the diſcomfiture of the French fleet he mounted the roſtrum and comforted the Convention by announcing a great victory and declaring that the Engliſh fleet had fled in conſternation from the ſcene of action purſued by the ſeven or eight miſſing ſhips of the republick. Were more neceſſary, many more examples of his total diſregard to truth might be produced from the minutes of the Convention.

A third inſtance of Billingſgate is the paſſage, in which I mention *the croaking ravens of oppoſition.* But why the *croaking ravens of oppoſition* ſhould be Billingſgate in my hiſtorick proſe more than the (*l*) *gaping raven of legacy-hunters* ſhould be ſo in Horace's ſatirick poetry neither this, nor, I believe, any other critick will ever be able to explain.

" I had ſaid " Norfolk and other peers, whoſe wealth aroſe principally from ancient grants of publick property, and who ought, for that reaſon, to have been the firſt to refund in ſupport of the conſtitution, endeavoured by their example to turn the tide of faſhion, and in lieu of their footmen powdered their horſes, cropping their own hair, as if they meant to reſemble French blackguards. Such was either the meanneſs of their avarice or the virulence of their animoſity againſt the government." Were not cropt heads and unpowdered locks at that period characteriſticks of all French and of moſt Engliſh blackguards? What

(*l*) — corvum deludet hiantem. Lib. 2. Sat. 5.

What further comment or apology then is required?

Speaking of Edmund Burke's virulence in his ſpeeches againſt Warren Haſtings I ſaid, "It is hardly doubtful that, if our political guide had ten years ago thrown him the large and welcome ſop, by which he has been recently lulled, it would have greatly abated the venom of his Cerberean ſlaver." This picture is entirely Virgilian in the moſt beautiful and ſublime part of his Epick poem, the lulling ſop and ſlavered mouth being only copies of certain features peculiar to one of his infernal gods and to a prophetic Sibyl. (*m*) Whoever has in Weſtminſter-hall ſeen Burke pouring torrents of calumny upon Warren Haſtings and charging him in theatrick attitude with rapine, rape and murder, and with ſqueezing, for the purpoſe of extorting a diſcovery of hidden treaſure, women's breaſts between wedges; whoever, I ſay, has beheld Burke in theſe extravagant fits of rage wiping off foam with his white handkerchief muſt acknowledge that I have exhibited a juſt likeneſs and not a diſtorted caricature.

Having ſpoken "of an extraordinary and dangerous influx of foreigners, and particularly of the infamous band of aſſaſſins, or 1,200 knights of the dagger, who were ſworn, but not gratis, like Mutius, to murder kings" I am charged with having written "a ſentence that requires explanation; who *the* infamous band of aſſaſſins was, thus ſworn to murder kings, our author has left to the ſagacity and conjecture of his readers: but this hiſtory, truly, he has written for poſterity! it is dark and

(*m*) — Soporatam offam—
Os rabidum, fera corda—lib. 6. lin. 420 & 80.

unintelligible, even to contemporaries. Who are theſe *inſinuated* aſſaſſins? Where are theſe 1,200 knights of the dagger? yet in the boſom of this country?" No; it is to be hoped that with their leader Rotondo, who was at the time here ſpecified in London and boaſted that he had ſtabbed nine Royaliſts with his ſingle dagger, they are no longer aiding *the croaking ravens* of republicaniſm but feeding the pecking ravens of the gibbets. Had not this wiſe critick read the volume backwards, as a certain being is ſaid to peruſe the Lord's prayer, he would have found the inexplicable riddle fully developed. In page 268, which in the uſual way of reading precedes page 335, he may ſee theſe words, "Nor was this diabolical ſpirit of aſſaſſination confined to the vulgar; the legiſlative body felt the contagion. Debrie, a diſtinguiſhed Jacobin deputy, propoſed that a volunteer regiment of *twelve hundred regicides* ſhould be raiſed and armed with daggers and other inſtruments of murder for the extirpation of kings and their generals; and that they and their deſcendants to the fourth generation ſhould be rewarded with a penſion of a thouſand livres." Nor is this all. The arguments on both ſides of ſo honourable a propoſal are fully detailed. May I not therefore juſtly ſuſpect that this writer, in order to render my triumph more eaſy, acts here the part of a drudge, who pays to a potboy a penny for cutting the leaves of a book, that his employer, the proprietor of the Review, may imagine that it has not been criticiſed without being read?

With the ſame beneficent view he denies, in contradiction to me, that pikes, battle-axes and caltrops were fabricated by the Scotch and Engliſh Conventions for the purpoſe of reſiſting in due

due time the Britiſh legiſlature. And upon what authority? Upon the authority of ſome ridiculous aſſertions made in oppoſition to the evidence produced before the Privy Council and to the Reports made by Committees of both the Upper and Lower Houſe by Richard Brinſley Sheridan!!! a rare patriot, and a gentleman, whom I am accuſed of having treated with abuſe, becauſe in deſcribing his perſon I have ſaid that "his face is generally enriched with rubies." If this be abuſe, what muſt we think of Salluſt, who ſays of Catiline that "with a bloodleſs complexion he had ugly eyes?" (*n*) what of Suetonius and Tacitus, of whom the former declares that the face of Tiberius was (*o*) frequently disfigured with botches, and (*p*) the latter with ulcers and plaſters? The fact is that truth ſhould be the firſt object of an hiſtorian; and it is not to be ſacrificed to any temporary advantage reſulting from the oily tongue of flattery.

The following portrait I remember to have read in ſome Latin author. "(*q*) Ptolemy excited no leſs ridicule among the Romans than terrour among his own ſubjects. His ſtature was ſtunted, and his belly prominent; ſo that he reſembled a beaſt more than a man." Had any ſuch words been found in my character even of any ſubordinate leveller, to what invectives muſt I have been expoſed! ſince invective has been my lot merely for allowing Pitt the praiſe of ſuperiour

(*n*) Colos ei exſanguis, fœdi oculi.—Bell. Cat.

(*o*) Crebri tumores, &c. Tib. Ed. Delph. Lond. cap. 68.

(*p*) Quippe illi ulceroſa facies et medicaminibus interſtincta. Ann. lib. 4. cap. 57.

(*q*) Ptolemæus autem non erat minus ridiculus Romanis quam terribilis ſuis; ſtatura enim brevis, & venter prominulus, ut ſimilior eſſet belluæ quam homini.

periour ſkill in finance. "Some of our readers, ſays this reviewer, may have ſtudied the valuable, but *ominous* tracts on finance, which have been publiſhed by Mr. William Morgan and Lord Lauderdale: it may excite a ſmile in them---perhaps too a ſmile of contempt, to hear Mr. Pitt extolled as a financier: no one, however, will be ſurpriſed at our author's repelling the charge of apoſtaſy and deſertion from his immaculate hero, when he reads a few pages onwards the following eulogy on the rectitude and conſiſtency of Mr. Dundas!" The abſurdities of punctuation and other barbariſms in this patchwork of incompatible ſentences I need not point out to the claſſical reader, nor will it be neceſſary to repeat the quotations already produced in proof of my independence on miniſtry or on the adverſe faction. But hearing that a contrary whiſper is circulated I here ſolemnly declare that I never had the leaſt communication directly or indirectly with any perſon that now is or ever was miniſter, except the late Earl of Chatham, when out of office, who five and twenty years ago thinking my compoſitions not below his notice, like this ſapient critick, ſent me in his own hand-writing a note explanatory of his publick conduct in a particular caſe, which, he thought, I had through miſtake miſrepreſented.

Morgan's and Lauderdale's *valuable and ominous* tracts on finance, however, come in ſuch a queſtionable ſhape that I muſt ſpeak to them. Truth and the intereſt of my country require that they and their abettors ſhould be expoſed.

The two doughty champions here ſo much extolled have in their rage to wound Pitt given themſelves a mortal ſtab. The former, to diſcredit the bank and to depreſs the ſpirits of the publick,

publick, contends that "the permanent debt due to the bank from government is a marketable commodity to be diſpoſed of before the expiration of their charter, and that there will be ultimately a deficiency." But from the reports of the different committees of finance it appears that, as the nation is bound to pay the whole at par, there will be, inſtead of a deficiency, a ſurplus of nearly 4 millions, and conſequently a bonus of 35l. 5s. per cent. above the capital.

He contends that the article of extraordinaries is not under the controul of parliament, though it may reduce or reject any charge, as well as any other head of expence. With equal accuracy and truth he aſſerts that theſe extraordinaries amounted in 1796 nearly to 8 millions, though it appears from the Reports mentioned above that they hardly exceeded 4 millions; and that the uneſtimated extraordinaries of the ordinance, which by him are ſaid always to outweigh the eſtimated, proved in 1796 to be the lighter of the two in the financial balance. The eſtabliſhment of the ſinking fund, which by the bye he confounds with the maſs of the national debt, he calls a deluſion. But, deluſion as it is, it has paid off 24 millions of debt, and with the fund of 1 per cent. yields an annually increaſing ſum of *three millions and a half*. The ſame documents, if conſulted, will ſhow that, by including in the national debt the ſums redeemed and funded, and by blending the fund of 1 per cent. with the aggregate intereſt, he has ſwelled the principal to 40 millions and the annual charges to 2 millions above their real amount. Such is the ſubſtance of Morgan's *valuable* tracts! ſuch his financial ſkill! ſuch his veracity!

Now

Now let us ſoar into higher regions, and come to the (r) cloud-capt tracts of Lauderdale, I beg pardon, I meant to ſay, of the Right Honourable the Earl of Lauderdale, &c. &c. This celebrated financier tells us that every loan draws its amount from commerce. But how long has it this effect? As long only as it remains unpaid in the Exchequer and unexpended by the ſoldiers and ſailors and other ſervants of the publick; and, as it is paid only by inſtalments, no more than a ſingle depoſit can well lie dead at a time, and that for a very ſhort period, in the treaſury. Were not this the real ſtate of the caſe, this year's ſupply and therefore the expenditure, amounting to 42 millions and upwards, would exhauſt the whole ſpecie of the kingdom; and the bankers could not, as they now do, aſk whether the bearer of a draught wiſhes to be paid in ſpecie or in bank-notes. The truth therefore will oblige him, if he is not callous and has not a face armed with triple braſs, to retract his words and to confeſs that we carry on the war not with our capital but with our revenue. Having miſtaken the funding of navy-bills for the borrowing of money and a contract for a loan for its payment he makes the money borrowed at the time that he wrote, in 1796, 61,651,096 inſtead of the real ſum 26,217,272; a blunder amounting to more than 34 millions.

Theſe two empiricks, for, after what has been proved, the term cannot be deemed too harſh; theſe two empiricks, in order to depreciate Pitt and to create national deſpondence, ſwell the expenſe of the preſent war by diſhoneſtly calculating

(r) Nubium tractus. Horace.

ing the intereſt of the ſums borrowed on the rates fixed for the laſt years; and, though the miniſter's plan of converting all the national debt into redeemable annuities will pay off the whole in 40 years, they repreſent it as permanent and eternal. Beſides, his Lordſhip in comparing the charges of the preſent and of the American war ſtates the latter to be 6,688,000, and the former 6,701,000, though they are in reality only 4,924,214; and his redoubted ſecond by falſely ſtating the Imperial loan, as ours, raiſes them ſtill higher. What an honourable couple! But prevarication is perhaps allowable in modern patriots and ſpeculators in Engliſh funds and national domains.

To counteract the miſchievous tendency of the ſtatements made by this precious pair of calculators it may not be amiſs perhaps to give here a ſimultaneous view of the national finances.

FINANCIAL SYSTEM FOR 1797.

The whole of the ſupply exactly	42,766,000
Out of this ſum there were repaid to the bank	7,000,000
Applied to the ſervices of 1796 more than	6,000,000
Extraordinary payments formerly unliquidated till next year	8,000,000
Lent to the Grenada merchants	900,000
Deduct then theſe particulars from the ſupplies and the whole ſum borrowed will amount to	21,000,000

And this ſum too was borrowed, if the articles be averaged, at an intereſt of 6l. 7s. 6d. when ſtock purchaſed in the 3 per cents. would fetch 6l. 14s.

But what is the aggregate of the whole national debt?

Debt

	Principal.	Charges & Intereſt.
Debt incurred before 1793	217,634,961	8,583,027
Do. in the 3 per cents. conſ.	98,490,071	2,954,700
Do. in the 3 per cents. red.	11,726,762	351,803
Do. in the 4 per cents. conſ.	12,208,744	488,350
Do. in the 5 per cents. conſ.	10,241,031	512,052
Do. in 5 per cent. annuities	20,250,000	1,012,500
Do. in long annuities		269,624
Charges of management		72,814
Total exiſting debt	£ 370,551,569	14,244,870

Now what proviſion is made for the payment of this debt?

All the charges on the conſolidated fund are

1. The intereſt and charges as per above acct.	14,244,870
2. Sinking fund of 1786	1,761,997
3. 1 per cent. on the ſinking fund	1,654,408
4. Civil Liſt	900,000
	£ 18,561,275
The ſinking fund with new taxes produces	21,474,179
The difference or ſurplus is	£ 2,912,904

Much of which will be applicable to any contingency, as all will not be exhauſted by a peace-eſtabliſhment; and, as was ſhown before, the principal will be paid off in 40 years.

The progreſſive ſtate of the Britiſh revenue's improvement may be conceived from the following obſervations. The books of the cuſtom-houſe will evince that, for 70 years antecedent to the American war, the imports and exports increaſed from 10,675,699 to 22,763,663, or at the rate of 110 per cent.; while they have, during the laſt 14 years, riſen from 24,400,294 to 53,434,185, or at the rate of 120 per cent. The Britiſh debt on the contrary roſe, during the former period, from 54,145,364 to 257,213,043, or at the rate of 375 per cent.; whereas, during the latter period, it has been accumulated only to 370,118,619, or at

at the rate of 43 per cent. Hence it appears that, though our burdens have increaſed, our powers to bear them have increaſed with ſtill greater rapidity; and there is no reaſon to ſuſpect that our agriculture has not kept pace with our commerce. How then are the mighty fallen! What unlucky ſtar lighted our critick to this unfortunate couple, who by going out of their ſphere are become the ridicule of children? He certainly meant them as captives to grace my victory.

In my preface I had ſaid that "I wiſhed in hiſtory to approach, if I could not reach, the ſtandard of antiquity." On theſe words the remark of the critick is that with reſpect to ſtyle "far from reaching the ſtandard of antiquity I am ſurpaſſed by many a modern." Does not he admit here the ſuperiority of the ancients, and is it not commendable in an author to imitate the beſt models? With regard to the moderns I have no where claimed an equality, much leſs a ſuperiority. Indeed they have not been in the leaſt the objects of my imitation; as they have not been, like the Greeks and Romans, my conſtant ſtudy.

But the critick proceeds, "What ſhould we think of Dr. Robertſon, had he heaped half the Billingſgate abuſe on the counſellors of Charles or Francis, which Mr. M. has done on ſeveral exiſting characters in France and England? How would he have degraded himſelf in our eſtimation!" Let us try then whether he does not deſerve this degradation. "*Chievres, his wife and Sauvage, whom Charles had imprudently raiſed to be chancellor* of Caſtile, vied *with each other* in all the *refinements* of *extortion* and *venality*." Vol. II. p. 44 of Charles V. Dr. Robertſon (for we muſt

give him his title) not ſatisfied with this treatment of Charles's miniſters does not ſpare even Charles or Charles's people. In the 3d vol. p. 419, he tells us that "Charles's ambition was inſatiable, he had often recourſe to low artifices, and his inſidious and fraudulent policy appeared more conſpicuous," &c. In his hiſtory of America (Vol. II. p. 261) he ſays "Inſtances of ſuch general and avowed contempt of the principles and *obligations* which *attach man to man* and *bind* them together in ſocial union, rarely occur in hiſtory. It is only where men are far removed from the ſeat of government, where the reſtraints of law and order are little felt, where the proſpect of gain is unbounded and immenſe wealth may cover the crime by which it is acquired, that we can find any parallel to the levity, the rapaciouſneſs, the perfidy and corruption prevalent among the Spaniards in Peru." Except ferocious courage and perſeverance, he allows no virtue to the Anabaptiſts or Jacobins of Charles's days, whom he loads with every opprobrious epithet. Have I treated their French imitators with more ſeverity? Are the portraits which I have ſketched of Robeſpiere and of the Duke of Orleans leſs liberal than his pictures of Muley Haſcen and Barbaroſſa? Have I condemned any man in ſuch unqualified terms as he applies to Alexander VI, when he ſtyles him "a pontiff infamous for every crime that diſgraces humanity"? But this Doctor is perhaps more favourable to the miniſters of Francis. Read and judge. (Vol. ii. p. 139.) "The government of Milan was committed by Francis to Odet de Foix, Marechal de Lautrec, an officer of great experience and reputation, but haughty, imperious, rapacious and incapable either of liſtening to advice or of bearing contradiction. His inſolence and exactions totally

totally alienated the affections of the Milaneſe from France, drove many of the conſiderable citizens into baniſhment and *forced others to retire for their own ſafety.*" (Vol. ii. p. 192 and 193.) The chancellor Duprat, a man, who by a baſe proſtitution of great talents — and by employing all the artifices and chicanery of law," &c. If I am illiberal, what is now become of the Doctor's liberality? Let not the reader, however, imagine that theſe paſſages are quoted in order to attach any blame to the Doctor. By no means. As far as ſentiments are here concerned, none but a temporiſing ſycophant would uſe any other mode of writing hiſtory. Were I to cenſure him in this reſpect, I muſt cenſure much greater hiſtorians, Salluſt, Tacitus and Buchanan, in whoſe footſteps I have endeavoured to tread. Had I called any Engliſh Jacobin *an abominable fellow*, as the firſt *(s)* has called Piſo, or, in comparing two republicans, adopted the language applied by the ſecond to Vinnius and Laco and called *(t)* the one the worſt and moſt wicked, and the other the moſt worthleſs and ſlothful, of mortals; or that of the third in deſcribing Luctacus, and painted one of them *(u)* as a lewd and flagitious wretch entirely addicted to wine and proſtitutes, reſtrained neither by reverence for the laws nor by regard to matrimony from inceſt or from any ſpecies of luſt, what a hue and cry would have been raiſed againſt me by the whole poſſe of theſe criticks at the head of their myrmidons, the Correſponding Society!

(s) Fœdum hominem.

(t) T. Vinnius & Cornelius Laco, alter deterrimus mortalium, alter ignaviſſimus odio flagitiorum, &c. Hiſt. lib. 1. c. 6.

(u) — Filius flagitioſiſſimus ſe totum vino et ſcortis dedit. Nullam ab ejus libidine vel propinqua cum ipſo cognatio, vel reverentia legum, vel maritorum reſpectus, vindicabat. Rex 22.

But *in ſtyle*, forſooth, I am *far from approaching many of the moderns*. Since Dr. Robertſon's name is here ſo prominent, I preſume that his works are thruſt into the foreground as the moſt perfect models of modern compoſition. Firſt of all then let us analyſe the foregoing quotations, and try whether the expreſſions printed in Italicks will bear the teſt of criticiſm. The firſt ſentence, to be perſpicuous, grammatical and unperplexed, ought to have been thus expreſſed, " Chievres, his wife and Sauvage, *the laſt* of whom Charles had imprudently raiſed to *the chancellorſhip* of Caſtile, vied *one with another* in all the *refinements* of *extortion* and venality. Whatever venality may be, extortion, a word implying violence, cannot be remarkable for *refinement*.

In the third ſentence are theſe words, " obligations which attach man to man and bind them together, that is, bonds which bind *man to man (*for *men to men)* and bind them together.

In the fifth ſentence Lautrec's violence and exactions, it is ſaid, drove many of the conſiderable citizens into baniſhment and forced others *to retire* for their own ſafety. Where did theſe exactions force them to retire? into a foreign land or country? If the former idea was to be conveyed, the expreſſion is an abſurd repetition; if the latter, it is what the Greeks denominate a hyſteron proteron or in vulgar language ſetting the cart before the horſe and obliging the mind of the reader firſt to travel abroad, then to return home, and finally to make an excurſion into the country; and, in either caſe, (as retirement is a leſs evil than baniſhment,) a vicious arrangement called in rhetorick an anticlimax and a ſpecimen of ſinking in proſe.

Vol. ii. p. 352. " Having finiſhed his plan of reformation, his next care was to provide for the defenſe

deſenſe of the city, &c. The two participles *having finiſhed* are here without a ſubſtantive to which they can be referred. The ſentence ſhould have begun thus, Having finiſhed his plan of reformation he next took care, &c. or thus, His plan of reformation being finiſhed, his next care, &c. Hundreds of examples of this ungrammatical ſtructure might here be ſpecified in Dr. Robertſon's works.

Vol. ii. p. 348. " While theſe tranſactions were carried on, &c. that is, while theſe actions *carried over* were *carried on*. The expreſſion ſhould have ſtood thus, *during theſe tranſactions*.

Vol. i. p. 152. Hiſt. Scotland. *None* of her women *were* ſuffered inſtead of *none* of her women was ſuffered, none being only a contraction of *no one*. This barbariſm, though found in other authors, is not for that the leſs ungrammatical.

P. 153. The warrant was iſſued and the earls of Shrewſbury, &c. empowered to put it in execution. Here the verb *were* is wanted before *empowered* to make the expreſſion grammatical. The paſſage ſhould have been thus worded, The warrant being iſſued, the earls of Shrewſbury, &c. were empowered, &c. Of this blunder alſo there are endleſs examples in Dr. Robertſon's models of ſtyle.

P. 52. of i vol. of Hiſt. Scotland. James ordered her body to be removed to Weſtminſter and to be depoſited *among the monarchs of England* inſtead of *among the remains of the Engliſh monarchs*. In his character of Mary he ſays that her eyes were *a dark grey*. What! does mere colour conſtitute eyes? He ſhould have ſaid " the colour of her eyes was a dark grey." The laſt words of the ſame character are theſe, " No man ever beheld her perſon without admiration and love *or will*

will read her hiſtory without ſorrow, " that is, or *no man will read it.* How aukward! how much better would it be to have ſaid *nor will any man,* &c. But why ſhould I multiply quotations of diſentangled ideas and ungrammatical phraſeology from this author! Near the beginning of this very Mary's character there are four complete ſentences, I beg pardon, I mean four incomplete ſentences, without a leading verb indicative, or imperative, affirmative, or negative. Yet this is the paragon of perfection held up by theſe criticks to admiring eyes as a polar ſtar in the trackleſs ocean of compoſition! To them he may be a fit object of imitation. Novices, as Quintilian ſays of boys, will hardly poſſeſs the courage of attempting what they deem the height of eloquence; they will rather graſp at what is more within their reach, like vines which elms ſupport, and which by catching firſt the lower branches climb up at laſt to the upper.

A critick in the European Magazine, after allowing that my " ſtyle on the whole is natural and ſuch as becomes the dignity of hiſtory," excepts the following paſſage as " neither natural nor dignified." But, ſince he wiſhes to write with ſuch brevity and conciſeneſs as *to oppreſs neither the preſent age with yawning nor future generations with a nauſea,* his Annals of Europe will be limited in their extent by his ideas of propriety and reputation and not by any proſpects of influence and emolument." Does the preface, from which the reprobated words printed in Italicks are quoted, require the ſame elevation of language as the body of the hiſtory? Without availing myſelf of this plea I may perhaps be allowed to prefer my own taſte to the critick's, ſince I have onl yadopted the ideas of Seneca and Cicero in two of their beſt perfor-

performances. The former in his treatiſe on the Tranquillity of the mind ſays " (*x*) What reaſon have you for granting ſuch an indulgence to a man *yawning* in the midſt of a thouſand books? And the latter in his Dialogues concerning the Nature of the Gods uſes theſe expreſſions, (*y*) How much better would it have become you, Velleius, to acknowledge your ignorance of what you did not know than by ſuch prate to excite *a nauſea* and to put one out of humour with himſelf!"

But of this egotiſm I am, and, I believe, my reader is, tired; for I think that it can only be juſtified by the neceſſity of ſelf-defenſe. If I have uſed any harſh expreſſions concerning the dead or the living, they were not voluntary but extorted. Had the criticks ſpoken of my work with that moderation, which the ſcantineſs of their learning and the mediocrity of their talents demanded, their criticiſms might have paſſed in ſilence to the grocer's and cheeſemonger's ſhops to which, according to their uſual deſtination, they are faſt approaching. There is ſeldom an evil, however, that is not attended with ſome good. Their malevolence has furniſhed me with an opportunity of publiſhing an opinion, which I have long entertained, that, till Reviewers of acknowledged abilities and eſtabliſhed reputation ſubſcribe their names and additions to all the articles reviewed, their praiſe or cenſure will merit little attention.

Let

(*x*) Quid habes cur—ei ignoſcas inter tot millia librorum *oſcitanti*, &c. Tom. ii. p. 226. Edit. Manfré—Patavii.

(*y*) Quam bellum erat, Vellei, confiteri potius neſcire quod neſcires quam iſta effutientem *nauſeare* et ipſum ſibi diſplicere. Lib. i. Cap. 30. Olivet Edit.

Yet I will not addreſs theſe criticks in Cicero's words to Antony, " Quidlibet, modo ne nauſeent, faciant." Philipp. ii.

> Let thoſe teach others who themſelves excel,
> And cenſure freely who have written well.

Such writers having characters at ſtake and knowing that

> Whoever thinks a perfect piece to ſee
> Thinks what ne'er was, nor is, nor e'er ſhall be,

will, from a ſenſe of their own defects and from the poſſibility of retaliation, ſpeak of others with ſome degree of caution, candour and modeſty, and not raſhly incur the danger of ſeeing their publications expoſed by the detection of faults ſimilar and perhaps ſuperiour to thoſe, which they condemn. Till this reform, which, I hope, is not far diſtant, take place, the Monthly Epitome, which contains only a ſimple analyſis and bare extracts from new publications, is preferable to the Reviews, which have been the ſubject of my preſent animadverſions, the firſt being diſtinguiſhed for inſipidity, and the third for barbariſm, and both of late notorious no leſs for the cordial reception, which they give to the moſt deſpicable effuſions of Levellers than for the furious zeal, with which they perſecute the beſt authors, who are friendly to our mixed conſtitution.

FINIS.